THE ARTERNATUR INTELLECT

CHARLES FERGUSON

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



FROM

Wm. Sulzer

Cornell University Library arV11807

1924 031 448 131



The original of this book is in the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in the United States on the use of the text.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

"A Great Book of a Great Epoch"

EDWIN MARKHAM says: "It has style, insight, high seriousness, spiritual passion. It is a great book of a great epoch."

JULIAN HAWTHORNE says: "He is a voice speaking unfamiliar things, with good emphasis and discretion."

CHARLES H. PARKHURST, D.D., eays: "An interesting, stimulating, startling, and, all in all, wonderful book."

THE RELIGION OF DEMOCRACY

A Memorandum of Modern Principles

Rev. Philip Moxom, D.D.: "It is great in that it clearly belongs, as do few books in a century, to the prophetic literature of the world."

George Hodges, D.D., Dean Episcopal Theol. School, Cambridge, Mass.: "It differs from the current sociology as Carlyle's French Reyolntion differs from the history of the schools. . . . The reader never fails to be stimulated and strengthened."

Ella Wheeler Wilcox: "It is a clarion cali to a higher civilization."

Boston Transcript: "Probes as deep as Carlyle, and smites with the strength of Ruskin. . . ."

The Sun, Baltimore: "There is etrength in this book—the strength of a crusader who strikes boldly and goes etraight to the point."

T. T. Munger, D.D.: "A brilliant, searching book, that reminds one of 'Sartor Resartus.'"

12mo, Cloth. Price, \$1.00. Post-paid

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, Pub'rs
44-50 East 23d Street, New York.

THE AFFIRMATIVE INTELLECT

An Account of the Origin and Mission of the American Spirit

BY

CHARLES FERGUSON

Author of "The Religion of Democracy"

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON

1910

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Preface	•	5
Introduction		7
CHAPTER I		
The Secret of Evolutionary Progress .	•	15
CHAPTER II		
The Superstition of Arbitrary Law		30
CHAPTER III		
The Two Opposite Sanctions of Social Orde	1	42
CHAPTER IV		
The Revolutionary Church-idea	•	61
CHAPTER V		
The Positive Organization of Society .		79
CHAPTER VI		
The Axioms of the Affirmative Intellect		113
CHAPTER VII		
The Working-out of the World Problem		150

The shout of the battle dies away. We are tired of the heroism of crowds. One crowd is no better than another crowd, and never was better. The only availing victories are those that one man wins against the mob.

wins against the moo.

Every man's body is environed with a sacred precinel; and every fine, free life is a challenge to all the world. To be a friend to another is to defy him. And it is death to surrender to a friend—fataler than to any enemy.

The greatest man is the Man that is nearest—and farthest away. My arm is around His neck, yet I have never touched Him and dare not. He has broken bread with me familiarly, and I have been filled with awe, as if I had seen God.

INTRODUCTION

The real battles of history—those that have issues—are those waged between the men of affirmative and creative intellect on one side and the men of negative and passive intellect on the other. The creative intellect is that which is dominated by the ideal—never for a moment abandoning the heart's desire and the inner law of humanity. The passive intellect is that which is cowed by the appearance of things and prostrated to an external law. On both sides there are those called a priorists and those called a posteriorists—on both sides men of letters, men of science, and men of affairs.

On the side of the creative intellect there are craftsmen, and there are men who spend their lives over microscopes and in laboratories, side by side with the makers of statues and sermons. And on the side of the negative intellect may be found theologians who postpone to a book the

authority of their own souls, listed in common cause with biologists who would govern society by the motions of bacteria, and statesmen who would buy an archipelago and slay a nation for the sake of the sanctities of property law.

The "original sin" of the world is, as we have been told, the rejection of the human ideal and the going in search of a non-human law of good and evil. The world's redemption is in the Man who is utterly true to his humanity—in whom it is discovered that in the depths of a man are real freedom and creative power. So it may be said of the poet, the artist, the man of science—any one who lives and works in the strength of the creative mind—he is begotten, not made; he is not of the substance of the creation, but of the Creator.

The history of the world is a struggle—on the whole a successful struggle—of the creative intellect against the terror and the discouragement of the external law. It is the progressive endeavor of the human spirit to make itself at home in the universe, and to fashion the stubborn things of Nature according to the uses of the soul.

Introduction

The central drama of history is Christianity, which is in its broadest aspect simply the attempt to supersede the old world social order, governed by an external authority and the prepossessions of the passive intellect, by a new world-order governed by an internal authority—the faith of the affirmative spirit.

The meaning and use of the historic Church is that it has served as a mighty causeway between the old order and the new—between theocracy and democracy. It belongs to both the old and the new. For a thousand years it gestated the soul of the West in the womb of the East. The very nature of the Church, in its medieval constitution, was contradiction; it could not otherwise have done its work. Every dogma of the Church was a proclamation of liberty framed in the language of slaves. Every sacrament was a pledge of equality, making its difficult appeal in the acceptable symbols of privilege and caste.

The inner logic of the Church's great system of administration was not the permanent separation of the sacred from the secular, but the winning of a new polarity of social organization.

The social ideal of the modern world was born out of the bosom of the Church. Americanism is the evolutionary product of historic Catholicism; for the quintessence of the old Catholicism was simply the attempt to establish a great social order, not by external authority and the compromise of interests, as in the "kingdoms of the world," but through the purification and the concurrence of wills.

In the last analysis there are but these two possible forms of social order—there are these two opposite and contradictory conceptions of the sanction of social law. The sanction, the force of the law, is either outside of mankind or it is within. Either it is in the nature-of-things and the arbitrary will of God, or else it is the will of the people—the heart's desire of humanity.

The idea that the will of the people could be the source of social law was born into the world with great travail. It was for ages difficult, even impossible, to conceive such an idea. The wills of the people seemed so shallow and weak, or else so irrational and contradictory. But Christianity is the discovery of the infinite depth of the human

Introduction

will. And so for nearly two thousand years it has been possible to imagine that a multitude of men—the controlling element of a population—might be brought to desire and to will with steady insistence things that are beautiful and just. The Church of the Middle Ages stood as a provisional plan of such a social system. In the midst of a world-order based upon an opposite principle—the principle of the external law—the Church wrought into concrete forms and the solid structure of institutions the democratic ideal. It was a marvelous achievement—this magnificent roughsketching of a new world in the oppugnant materials of the old.

In the sixteenth century the idea of the social law as proceeding from the sanified and consentaneous wills of the people was fairly born into the secular world. The Church had poured its vital store into the lap of the nations. It had breathed out its very soul of liberty in the breath of the modern spirit. And for four hundred years democracy has wrestled for the spiritual order—for the sovereignty of the human ideal—in the open arena of the secular world. The

issue has commonly found a statement in terms of politics and the forms of government, but that is superficial. The issue reaches to the intimacies of life; it is revolutionary in the spheres of morals, law, art, science, and economics.

Despite the political forms of democracy, more or less espoused by every nation in Europe, the trembling scale has nowhere in the world fairly turned against the old régime save in one country—the United States of America. In England the scale balances in an unstable equilibrium, but with a marked tendency toward reaction and a return to the past. In every other country of Europe the social center of gravity still rests unmistakably in the old order.

Everywhere a state-supported Church stands as the symbol of the unbroken sway of dogma—the preponderance of the passive intellect, the rule of a non-human and external law. America stands alone for the Church-supported state—a faith-supported commonwealth. We have openly discredited here every semblance of external authority, and have removed all the symbols of dogma from the forum of our common life.

Introduction

If there be only a God of Sinai and no God of the Soul of Man, certainly we are in a way to find it out with cost—for we have rested the stupendous weight of a vast social system upon the possibility that a controlling majority, or minority, here will wish for what is fine and will a law that is fair.

The law of America is not static, but vital. It rests upon no tradition, no code, no perfected system; it undertakes to win and dominate the world by the sheer kinetic reasonableness of the creative intellect.

America—standing alone among the nations in the morning of the last cycle of two millenniums girds herself to the fulfilling of the ancient faith.

CHAPTER I

THE SECRET OF EVOLUTIONARY PROGRESS

I. Considering our modern faith in the unity of the world, it would seem reasonable to suppose that the secret of the success of nations is closely related to that of the success of individuals, and, in turn, it would seem that the answer to the question, What is the greatness of great men? should contain the answer to a certain other question which has staggered all the biologists up to this time—the question, namely, of the motive force of progress in organic evolution, What is it that makes life go forward?

The evolutionary experts have, to speak generally, established nothing but the broad proposition that all kinds of life, from the lowest to the highest, are somehow related by heredity. It is satisfactorily shown that altho man may not have sprung from the monkey, yet the two have,

somewhere in the beginnings of life, a common ancestry.

At this juncture the scientists have abandoned us to our relations, without giving us any suggestions for proving our own prestige. They have discovered no principle of progress—no justification of the claim for an upward and forward tendency in evolution. For all that they have shown us to the contrary, we are bound to conceive of life as flowing in an accidental, indeterminate way, or swirling in meaningless cycles. We ask, How can the stream rise higher than its source? how can the less produce the greater? And there is no answer. The men of science have completely failed to show how it is that life can mount and meliorate. They have found out nothing of the energy and spring, the push and go of evolution.

Darwin's natural-selection theory is now greatly discredited by the experts, and as an explanation of progress it was inadequate at best. Lamarck came near making a good guess, but his followers have broken up into rival camps and have not brought his suggestion to any effectual

issue. There have been a good many other speculators, but scarcely two of them have agreed.

All that the evolutionists have told us, therefore, about the life-process is very interesting, but it is not yet important. It does not teach us anything about the way of success, and it proposes no escape from the fearful round of human failure—we can not use it for the solution of the practical problems of human life.

II. There is an honored Socratic maxim that man himself is the measure of all things, and an Aristotelian one that the real nature of a growing thing is to be discovered only in its matured character.

Following these intimations, let us, in a tentative way, set down the formula of a scientific method which may afford us a key to the secret of the motive force of evolution, and to a good many other mysteries that remain to be explained. Find the deepest thing in the most representative person and you will have found the deepest thing in the protozoon.

It is time to give up trying to probe the nature of a man by looking hard at an amœba. Let us reverse the scientific process, and attempt rather to explain the lowest reaches of life by studying the inmost and simplest principle of humanity. For, try as he might, no man ever did succeed in divesting himself of his own soul, no one ever did or can escape from the human point of view or regard things from the thing-standpoint. Our science has in this regard suffered a delusion.

III. Now the principle of success in representative persons is, we may venture to affirm, a certain elemental faith or world-gripping self-persistence. The most superb and human man is the one that likes and roots himself in the widest range of real things. To feel solidly at home in the world of death, labor, and accidents, to find one's self in the whole constitution of it, to have the widest and deepest interests without capitulation or the sacrifice of one's one nature—that is to be representatively, redoubtably human.

All life—so far as we know or can know—exists in and through a very real and insistent

relation to its environment. And to say that this relation is the sine qua non of life is to say what is true, but it misses the principal point; that point is that the internal law of the organism must dominate the law of the environment. Certainly the living thing must keep up a cordial correspondence with the world around it, but the critical question remains, the question of life or death—to wit: Shall the organism assimilate the world to itself, or shall it assimilate itself to the world? In the one case there is growth and strength, in the other decline and dissolution.

What appears thus to be true in the lower regions of life we can feel and know to be true in the region of humanity. A man gains morally as he gains physically by assimilating the elements of the external world in the way of his own constitution. He must not, on pain of mental distraction and moral decay, vacate his own ideal or give up his own desire. His health and sanity depend upon his wrestling confidently with the world for the things that he really cares about.

Absolute excellence for a man would be the facing of the innumerable difficult choices of life

—its contradictions, restraints, defeats—without once lapsing into self-pity or self-praise, and without once meditating a sacrifice of his human nature or questioning the validity and legitimacy of the elemental passion of his heart. It is an approximation to this excellence that characterizes the first-rate men of history and the heroes of scripture and romance. Absolute excellence is inextinguishable faith, and relative excellence is the maintaining of the widest and deepest possible relationships to the world with the fewest and least considerable capitulations.

Now the point here is that this quintessential faith—this confident embrace of the external world—is the principle of advance and success in all life from the mollusk to the son of man; and that, with due abatement of the intension of words, it is true to say that organisms of the very lowest order survive and prevail according to their self-loyalty and venturesomeness of faith. They make effectual connection with their environment when they have some degree of self-persistence in spite of difficulty—some pluck and potency of will, some inner energy of faith to

subdue the nature of the external world to that of their own lives.

Progress is in the spontaneous adventure of the living thing to assimilate to its own nature new and unprecedented circumstances—to find itself and make itself at home in a wider world. The spring is not in the will of an arbitrary and transcendent Providence, not in the force of circumstances, and not in fixed laws and resident forces. It is a principle of self-origination. It operates with an energy derived from a sphere superior to that of natural sequence and mechanical causation. It is creative rather than creaturely, and even in its lowest expressions it may be regarded as the embryonic representative of the free and creative spirit of man.

So it becomes possible to say of all life in its progressive and victorious aspects that it is begotten, not made—that it is of the substance of the Creator rather than of the creation.

To be sure, nobody knows, or can know by black-board demonstration, that the foregoing is the final truth of the matter; but it affords an hypothesis that has the advantage of explain-

ing the facts. And we must come to understand that valid science is not so much characterized by the conclusiveness of its proofs as by the practicability of its assumptions.

IV. We are told that all organisms are related by heredity; and what is heredity? What is it but the night-side of life—the negative of which life itself is the affirmative? It is the principle in biology that corresponds to the mechanical principle of inertia. Its essence is that it does nothing, works no changes. It is a fact, but it is not a force.

On the other hand, change is the very definition of life. The distinguishing note of an organism as marked off from the inorganic world is that it has in its own body a law of perpetual change. Heredity is the name given to the limited and temporary persistence of the things that life achieves. But life itself has always had a career outside of and beyond its past achievements. Over the realm of nature there has always brooded a realm of creative causes; and it is in the creative realm, and not in the realm

that is natural and created, that the progressive career of evolution is running its course. Every living thing has some sort of access to an everpresent store of original powers.

There is in a sapling tree a latency of enterprise, and real incalculable history in the wheeling wing of a hawk.

The chance of making a mark in the world—for a bat or a bee—depends not upon his circumstances or any decree of destiny, but upon his trust in the inner and upper powers—his draft upon the infinite.

Of course no bat and no bee ever did make much of a mark in the world. The pathos of the living universe is its inexhaustible stupidity and cowardice.

The constant tendency of all living things has been to settle back upon the precedents, and to rely upon a failing heredity and a mere habit or reflex action. The bathos and degeneration of life, its bestial ugliness, its physical goiters and contortions, are due to its faithless denial of its own desire—its low subserviency to circumstance.

V. The central interest of the world-process is the economy of this spontaneity of life, and the quickening and deepening of it into the serenity and gaiety of heart of high-spirited men. beginning the force of circumstances is nearly everything, and the spontaneity of life is nothing or next to nothing. But when the consummation is reached in a free and enterprising humanity the conditions are reversed—life becomes nearly everything, and circumstances nothing or next to nothing. Evolution is revolutionary. It moves forward by coups de main and conquest. It is the progressive supersession of the rule of seemingly fixed and static laws by the rule of an incalculable freedom. Mechanical force - the tyranny of the irrational elements of nature gives way to vital force, the energy of creative In the lower reaches of the process, as compared with the higher, heredity is relatively strong. It is likely enough that characteristics acquired in the lifetime of the individual are, in the lower orders, transmitted by heredity, but in higher life this seems generally not, to be the case. Heredity is seen to be a failing thing, and

the privileges that depend upon it are, with the advancement of the world, ever shorter and shorter lived. The competencies that avail in the highest circles can not in any considerable measure be passed on from generation to generation, but must be won out of the infinite by each individual for himself. In all that is great and prevailing an organism is born not of the flesh.

VI. The teleology of the life-process—its general aim and purport—is thus apparent enough. One can not contemplate the march of life from its status of creaturehood almost utterly subject to the law of its environment, to the status of free creatorship, pressing upon the breast of nature the image of a supra-natural ideal—without feeling that he is witnessing the unfoldment of a spiritual drama.

It is as if the desire of God had been from the beginning that he might escape from his absoluteness. He has been resolute to limit and share his liberty. It would seem that he has cared above everything that he should not be all in all, but that life might come into the world that

should look him unshrinkingly in the face and demand of him all that is reasonable and good.

It is unthinkable that God should create a free soul; the soul must be begotten and born; it can not be made. Neither can freedom be given as a gratuity—it can not exist in virtue of any charter or franchise. And the liberty of a reasonable man must be as deep as the liberty of God—a kind of participation in the creative responsibility—or else it is a fantastical illusion.

Doubtless God could have gotten himself a man in a moment of time and with little trouble if it had been merely a matter of executing his own laws and directing his own forces.

It took time and trouble—immeasurable eons of time and trouble—because he had to wait for the little living thing to move of its own motion to the exploitation of the universe. And he had to suffer meanwhile all the caricatures and contradictions of life that come of the waywardness and fatuity of the stumbling, groping, inchoate will. The difficulty of God in bringing a man to birth has been the stubborn, primordial inertia of all living things—a kind of sag and

gravitation back to mere mechanism, passivity, and poor creaturehood, a besotment of toryism and orthodoxy that reaches to the very grubs—always infidel at heart, and refusing to risk their lives in the current of the passing day.

One must not venture, then, to say that God has ever quenched the heart's desire, the quickening will, of any living thing. On the contrary, it would seem that he has nursed and fanned that little flame with stupendous patience for a billion years, as if it were his inmost wish that life should want something of him and make importunate demands.

So the legitimate lord of the world is the Heart's Desire of Humanity. The world is not to be governed by rapt consideration of what the soul ought to want, but by buoyant and venturesome struggle for the things that it really does want in the red heart and center of it.

VII. The novum organum here proposed—to wit, the scientific method which undertakes to find in the nature of man its hypotheses for the interpretation of the nature of the non-human

world—is, after all, very old. The simple truth is that in the last accounting no other method is possible.

It is found upon examination of history that scientific theories of the universe are invariably corresponsive with prevailing ethical theories of the nature of man. The mind can never escape from its own shadow-and light-but, spite of all premeditation, it always has written and doubtless always will write the theories of science in the characters of conscience. There must be virile ethics before there can be sound physics. Our biologists have cut the heart out of organisms, and treated life as if it were dough, because they are still under the spell of the soul-contemning theological habit. They owe their respectful acknowledgments to the clergy. If they were not so firmly persuaded that the right moral rule of human life is to be found in an external law, they would not have gone to their biological investigations with so stubbornly fixed a prepos session that the rule and explanation of all life is to be looked for in its environment. A mental habit does not necessarily change with a change

of opinions. The fathers worship an infallible book, and the children the invincible nature-ofthings; but it is all one and the same. Both refuse to see that life itself is original and an authority.

Modern scientific theory is morally pathological; it is low-spirited. It breathes the atmosphere of the failure and discouragement of the French Revolution. It could not possibly have grown up within the tonic range of Goethe and Diderot, or within sound of the song of Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Shelley.

CHAPTER II

THE SUPERSTITION OF ARBITRARY LAW

- I. If one would go to the root of the law of the social constitution, one must examine the idea of natural law; for human society has never defied the natural universe, but, on the contrary, has always shaped its ordinances in conformity with what it has supposed to be the fact of nature. Nature has ever been big and overwhelming, and the social state has from the beginning lain little in the hollow of her hand.
- II. Over against Nature stands the Man, and deep in his heart is the passion for liberty. For the passion for liberty is only another name for life itself. Liberty is a word of much sophistication, but it means, when it means anything, opportunity to live one's own life in one's own way.

Now, as intelligence brightens into intellect it would seem that a moment arrives when con-

Arbitrary Law

sciousness separates itself from the mere engrossment of passing experience, and reflection becomes possible. The man looks before and after, considers his disappointment of yesterday, his fear of to-morrow. He thinks, and the thought rises in his heart: "This nature-of-things which is so overwhelming in power, is it not also overbearing in disposition? Can I trust it farther and continue on my way, or would it not besafer to postpone my living for a while and sit down here to study out the law?"

The temptation is to cut the intellect loose from the heart of life and to live without risks. The man longs for a sure rule, an unquestionable definition of good and evil.

And so, in fine, he rejects what is interesting for what is authoritative. He sets out to follow after the things that he does not care for and to discover a truth that is more true than life itself. And after many ages and across world-tyrannies and the convulsions of nations he returns with a harvest of pedantries and prurient lusts.

The original sin of the world is not contempt for arbitrary laws, but respect for them. It is

the refusal to believe that nature is plastic to the ideal. It is the abject worship of the laws of creation, and the subjection of the creative soul to the authority of Things.

The process of spiritual redemption is a tonicing of the will with faith until it shall dare believe in its own desire, and be reassured of the authenticity of the ideal. The soul is taught to turn away from the bullying idols, to reject the evident gods that order us around, and to serve only the unseen God who backs us up.

This is not disdain of Nature, but the opposite of that. It is the embrace of Nature—manfashion—with an imperious tenderness that falls in love with all her ways, but will not suffer her to dictate.

III. Since the beginning the human mind has labored under the delusion that there exists, deep-bedded in the nature of things, a reverend and authoritative law that stands in its own right and without any relation to human nature. It has been supposed that this law is the absolute, capital truth; that it is capable of being elicited in

Arbitrary Law

one way or another—by gratuitous deliverances from Sinai, by vigils and prayers, by the diligent exercise of microscopes and spectroscopes; and that, once got, it can be done up in solid and imperishable propositions with which to rule the world—in chastened and martyred disregard of what a man cares for.

It seems that this is the chief of superstitions—the great apostacy. It is the rejection of that principle of faith, that confident embrace of Nature, which is the *elan* and impetus of whole sane life. The soul is split in two, a schism cuts across it, and it is ready for corruption.

In the first instance men are drawn to attempt this schism in the endeavor to escape from the mere assaults of Nature; but in the social order security from Nature gets itself refined into the forms of privilege. For social privilege has its origin in the discrediting of the human spirit and the setting up of an arbitrary and external law.

This is the great temptation of the stronger men of a society. For if they can but bring themselves to contemn the sane indicative passion of their own hearts, they can get all the crowd to

do the same; and after that they can discover and define the righteous law in the terms that suit themselves.

Of course it is not ordinarily a matter of craft or imposture; insincerity could never convince the crowd for long. It is that immedicable sin of pharisaism which, from a sincere faithlessness of heart, has always despised the *naive* soul of the people and rebuked the blasphemy of the Son of Man.

IV. In its normal exercise intellect is as inseparable from the elemental passion of life as the light from the heat of a flame. The disinterested pursuit of truth is at best an unconscious affectation, the blindness of the pharisee. A man can not go in knowledge further than the reach of his real interest and concern. And it is not possible to discover in nature any such thing as a non-human law—a law unrelated to human feeling. If such a thing existed we could not truly discover it, but could only caricature it into some kind of forced congruity with our soul-and-sense-penetrated human knowledge. This would be

Arbitrary Law

discouraging if human life in its nature went less deep than the roots of chemistry and physics. But if life is as real as things, the impossibility of escaping from the human point of view is cheerful enough, and does not preclude the practical certainties of science.

The serene and confident intellect ranging with unterrified eyes the vast realms of the universe, sees in it all simply the expansion of a congenial and familiar dwelling-place. For eons life has succeeded in making itself at home here in a narrow way; why now should it wince at wider horizons? Standing up before the universe, the living man sees in it just a great sane living body—corresponsive throughout with his own body—the microcosm exactly balancing the cosmos.

The inmost nature of Nature is seen to be human nature. And the knowledge of it—natural science—is like knowing a man—a genial, resistant, cosmic-tempered man.

It is possible to know a great many things about a man without being acquainted with him, and it is possible to be a very patient investigator

of Nature without acquiring any considerable amount of science. Science may make gains through patient investigations, but primarily it is not itself an investigation but an intimacy and a correlation. Sheer blank staring at things is not conducive to science. One can not make an inch of progress without assumptions—working hypotheses; and the hypotheses will not work unless they are true. So you can learn nothing about Nature unless you know her through and through already—just as you can not understand a word that a man says in the sense in which he says it, unless you know the heart of him before he begins to speak.

The man that you love and trust you feel to be of inexhaustible resource and full of surprises. You can not tell for a certainty what he will do; you can only be sure that he will not put you to moral or intellectual confusion, that his actions will be reasonable and humane. So Nature is unfathomable, surprising, indefinable. Its circle can not be squared. Its fluent life can not be caught into the forms of an abstract logic or compacted into inerrant propositions.

Arbitrary Law

The so-called laws of Nature are discovered to be not constitutional but only by-laws, relatively and provisionally applicable — good for frying fish and running railroad trains only so long as they are interpreted by cunning craftsmen with a measure of human genius for the equitable correction of the abstract law.

Pure science—science for its own sake—is not science at all. Nature mocks and eludes the passive intellect—the eunuchry of the mind. She aches to be compassed by a man—to be challenged from a lover's heart demanding answers that are intelligible to a man's soul—reasons that are human reasons.

V. An intellect without a will is cut at the roots and can never flower into science. For the intellect grows out of the will, and in its sanity and strength is constantly nourished by desire. The intellect is born in the wrestle with the elements of nature for the things that seem good to have. The inmost web and texture of it is will and choice—the setting of things in their relative places with reference to the appetency

of life. The first flicker of intellect is to be discovered in the earliest worm of the dust that was shocked out of oblivion by the external necessities of a divided way and roused to a choosing.

To be the primary worm and to be appealed to by the close feel of a forage that is good, and by the smell or sound or sight of one that is better but harder to crawl to, and then to make the great refusal, forsaking the line of least resistance and risking the way of the laborious ideal—that is to be the first of scientists and the founder of civilization. It is the beginning of the intellect. Ever since that first adventure of faith, the growing power of the intellect has been a waxing energy of choosing—a clarifying of desire.

It deepens and strengthens by dint of choices that are costly and ever costlier, and it flames up into its most vivid consciousness when the will goes forth in contempt of all the senses to seize upon the things that are eternal—but always its life and vigor is desire.

The exfoliation and fulfilment of one's own nature through the confident embrace of the

Arbitrary Law

world-nature and the wrestle with its elements to get the things one cares for—that is the only sound method of science.

VI. Modern science—in its sane moods—proceeds upon an immense assumption of faith—to wit, that Nature is unitary, that it is one vast, whole and organic body, that it is humanly reasonable clear through and viable to intellect. This assumption is made in the face of the universal experience of the diversity and multifariousness of nature—the infinite variability of phenomena. It is a surpassing act of faith.

And the fruitfulness of modern science, its practical availability for the uses of civilization, is accurately proportionate to its humanism—its adherence to the human point of view and freedom from abstraction.

It accomplishes most in the regions where it is least dogmatic. Its Synthetic Philosophy is a monument of futility, but its management of the confessed mystery of lightning is the poem of the age.

VII. It is, then, the revelation of the Modern

Spirit that truth for a man is to be had, not in the form of abstract propositions, but only in experience. The absolute is discovered to be not in any stated law or formula, but in the living, protean soul—so that men, if they would keep the garden and get justice done upon the earth, must break the hypnotic spell of abstract principles and live out riskily into the changeful world. The Will must bridle and bestride the Intellect if it would ride to its heart's desire.

This subjection of the intellect to the will is the psychology of the modern spirit and the clue to what is characteristic in modern history. It marks the transition of the consciousness of mankind from the status of a creature living by an external law, and wistfully longing for knowledge as to what kind of a being it ought to be, to the status of a creatorship that is law-making and self-governing.

The soul sets out to impose itself upon the universe with confidence that, in spite of appearances, it is possible to do so; that the constitution of the universe is not alien to the soul; and that the natural laws exist not to intimidate the spirit

Arbitrary Law

of a man but only to harden the bones and stiffen the thews of his liberty.

The intellect ceases to be the master of the will and becomes its servant. The world abandons the attempt to think out a way to right living, and determines to live and learn.

CHAPTER III

THE TWO OPPOSITE SANCTIONS OF SOCIAL ORDER

I. According to the depth of a man's sanity is the strength of his passion for order. A sane man is one that spends his working days in putting things in order and his holidays in rejoicing that it is possible to do so; while utter misery and madness is simply the persuasion that the world is hopelessly out of joint, and that the grounds of the soul have shifted into chaos. Insanity and folly are descriptions of a defective sense of order or a feeble passion for it.

We rejoice in relations and proportions, or else we do not rejoice at all; and the difference between a reasonable person and a fool is little else than that the former generally puts the first thing first, while a fool puts the second or third there. So civilization is the expression in manners and institutions of the passion for order. It is the fulfilment of the intellect, the delight in law.

Civilization is not an exact science; it is a miracle of fine art. And as fine art is the putting into materials of more than mere materials can possibly contain, so the work of civilization is to accomplish the marvel of expressing the infinite spirit of-liberty in the definite forms of law.

II. The foundations of the social law go down to unfathomable depths. The infinite element is due to the fact that a man's natural strength and wisdom are disproportionate to his interest in the world. There is a large overplus of interest that, in the nature of things, can not get itself adequately expressed in terms of law, but must always press in upon the law, shaping its ordinances in tentative conformity to an insatiable ideal.

This element of infinity might conceivably be eliminated from the social constitution by remedying in either of two ways the disproportion between mortal strength and human interest.

The constitution could be reduced to measurable proportions, and its foundations, from the bottom up, would stand in plain sight, if, on the

one hand, the people could be endued with practical omniscience and physical immortality, or if, on the other, they could be brought to take a sufficiently weak and shallow interest in real life.

The former method of effecting an equation does not lie, it appears, within the scope of our possibilities. But the latter method has, in the history of the world, been tried again and again, and always with considerable success. The secret of success in tyranny is the shallowing of the people's interest in this real world, either by diverting their hopes to another or by dulling their sensibilities and depressing their self-respect. And the society which is most tyrannical, and so most superstitious and sordid, is the very one in which the social structure is most measurable and definite, most amenable to the methods of what goes by the name of pure inductive science.

In the Chinese Empire an effort has been made on a grand scale and through a disciplinary regimen of ages to eliminate the infinite from history by squaring the soul to a mathematical definition of prudence and propriety. And China still

offers the choicest extant laboratory for our savants of the newly invented science of sociology. But they must be quick with their statistical machines, for there are signs that that Infinite which for so long has beat to windward in the offing, biding its time, is now about to enter full-sail into Chinese history.

III. Now the infinite and incalculable element underlying the social constitution is the subjectmatter of religion. Religion is, in its nature, a taking account of the infinite with reference to its resources for furthering or thwarting the heart's desire. It is the inevitable attempt of the human spirit to form a working estimate of the character of that all-encompassing Unknown Quantity in life which is always dealing with us and disposing of our affairs, whether we will or not. Religion begins at the point where the things that men really care about outgo their mortal reach and understanding. It is therefore universal, so far as human ideals are universal. Society, of whatever sort, presupposes ideal interests, and therefore presupposes religion-

presupposes in the people an interested estimate of the character and disposition of the Unknown Quantity. And society can not have a unitary and coherent constitution—must be merely inchoate and nebulous, or else dissolving and anarchic—unless a controlling element of the people rest in a practically concurrent estimate of the Unknown. The existence of a social state requires not merely religiousness but a definite religion.

There may, indeed, be many different cults, a variety of forms of worship; that is not a material matter; and there may be many theologies—philosophies wrought in the cold, dispassionate realm of the abstract intellect, creeds written in the mere memory and custom of men, and passed down along the dwindling lines of tradition—these things are of slight and measurable importance.

But the religion of the people, the actual and interested estimate of the character of that incalculable Soul and Body of the Universe in which our little fabric of social order is embosomed as a ship in the sea—this religion is the force and

sinew of civil law; and when it suffers definitive schism, social order becomes an impossibility.

IV. There is a sense in which it is true to say that society always has been and always must be ruled by force. For human life is an embodiment of ideal things in material forms, the effectuation of ideas in the dynamics of nature. And the most humane and millennial society can not be conceived of as expressing its ideals in abstraction from economic needs, or maintaining its organization otherwise than through the control of natural forces.

In another and more important sense, however, society never has been, and never can be, ruled by force, since, as has been pointed out, the social constitution is always grounded upon religion. A mob, a horde, there may be, living from day to day by the sheer rule of the strongest. But the idea of social law can not arise until a controlling element of the people are convinced of a common religion—agreed upon a common way of access to that overmastering Energy of the Universe upon which society must continu-

ally draw for the enforcement of its law. The savage warriors of a primeval commonwealth may raise their most muscular bully upon his shield and proclaim him king, but he rules not by force of his muscles—any two or three of his liegemen might meet him and undo him—but as the fit representative of those transcendent brutalities of nature which are the object of the common worship at a certain stage of human development.

Now, in a third and final sense, a sense most significant of all—and this is the particular point of this chapter—the truth is that society passes in the long course of history from the rule of natural forces to the rule of the human ideal.

V. In the earlier stages of its career society is governed by economic and defensive necessity; in the latter stages, through a process which is both evolutionary and revolutionary, it accomplishes its enfranchisement in such a heartening of the people as enables them to compass the natural laws and convert them to ideal and human uses.

The soul of tyranny is not the egotism and

oppression of the ruling class. That is only an incident. The life of social injustice is the faithlessness of the whole people. It is the common thraldom to the conception of a law of necessity, a fatality inherent in the nature of things—which is regarded as stronger than the soul of humanity with all the forces that humanity can possibly bring to bear.

The apparent arbitrariness of Nature—giving to men and withholding from them health, strength, beauty-is what gives countenance and confidence to the sentiments of hereditary privilege and legitimism. It is this seeming arbitrariness, therefore, that grounds the aristocratic régime. For the principle of aristocracy is the idea of natural or divine election, the idea that some men's lives are worth more and are more deserving than other men's. But this is not a class idea, tho it seems on the surface to inure to the benefit of a class. And the conception that underlies it, the conception of the rightful and inevitable domination of the external law of the universe over the internal law of humanity, a conception which to a great extent still engrosses

the common mind, is not and never was a class feeling. And they can never come at the heart of the social problem who approach it with class prejudice or in the prepossession of special interests.

The ruling classes have from of old ruled because of their representativeness. Social classes provide themselves from time to time with an assortment of class opinions, but deep beneath the surface of opinion the course of society is directed by the genetic ideas of its strongest spirits, and these ideas, preached or unpreached, pass out to the boundaries of the community by an irresistible contagion.

It would seem that successful governments always have been and always will be administered by minorities. But it is equally apparent that they always have been and always must be supported by majorities.

The crux of the social problem, the issue between the old régime and the new, is a question of the religious conviction of the common human mind as it faces the stupendous mystery of the universe.

So long as the people regard the transcendent Force or Spirit of the Cosmos as a power non-human and alien to humanity, so long society, under whatever political form, will continue to support a privileged class, and will continue, in spite of every protest of social sentiment, to be ruled by a principle of economic and defensive necessity. On the other hand, if the common mind of men can be brought to regard the great Cosmic Power as essentially human, it will be possible to frame and execute a social law that shall consider the liberties of persons above the sanctity of property or the grandeur of the state, and that will give practical expression to the human ideal.

VI. It is the fatalism of the people that gives sanction and strength to arbitrary and unequal codes of law. From the beginning the heart of the people has quailed not so much under the lash of the masters of society as beneath the incubus of that terrific and unintelligible law, natural or divine, of which the masters seemed to be the favored and authentic adminis-

trators. The paramountcy of status and the rights of property over free contract and the rights of persons—the thraldom of economic privilege—is a bitter fruit that has grown from that radical infidelity of the heart wherein men have rejected the fair Eden of their own ideal and cowered in the idolatry of an external rule of good and evil.

The gravamen of privilege is not inequality of material possessions. The longing for an equality of goods is the platitude of mechanical minds or the Utopian dream of envy. The mastery of materials and the appropriation of the good of things is the prerogative of an intense and affluent life. And the statutes can never run for long against wisdom and capacity, tho indeed it is to be noted that wealth does not consist in the owning of things, but in the appreciation of them.

The gist of the social crime of privilege is the legal emphasizing of personal inequality, the institutionalizing of the fatalistic doctrine of natural or divine election. The abolition of privilege means, therefore, not the equalizing of fortunes,

but the reconceiving of the whole fabric of the law in a new spirit, so that, whereas in the past its chief emphasis has been laid upon the safeguarding of exceptional deserts, it shall henceforth concern itself solely with the guaranteeing of a common liberty, the giving to every man the utmost chance.

VII. The real interest of democracy, in its negation of the principle of deserts, is to exalt and emancipate the human spirit.

It is as much concerned for those that have been regarded as the most deserving as for those that have been supposed to be the least so. Its program runs in the interest of the upper as well as the lower classes. For the operation of the principle of deserts degrades all alike in the subjection of the human spirit to an arbitrary and unhuman law. It assumes to measure men by a mete-yard of things and circumstances, and to pay the soul in preferments. Its constant appeal is to the footman's standard; it overwhelms the will with clothes and furniture.

The beauty, the art of the old régime is pam-

pered and hectic, a feeble and ineffectual protest against the besetting fatalism of society. For beneath the gilt and purple of the old order is the heart of the mob, the adulation of brute forces, and the terror of irrational necessity.

VIII. Social law is at last simply the objectification of the average intellect.

The intellect is often conceived of, in the fancy of psychologists, as a colorless medium, the pure white light in which a man stands face to face with the universe. But there is no such thing as an acromatic intellect. The essense of intellect is the principle of order, and the intellect must be penetrated through and through either by the order of the interior life of the man or else by that of the external universe.

All human activity may be summed up as consisting in the attempt to bring the external order of the universe to a harmony with the interior order of a man's life—his sincere conception of what is desirable. The gist of all thinking and working is the endeavor to ease the strain of the disparity between the desire of the heart and

the facts of the world. And since in all sound thinking and working both terms of the contradiction are to be accepted as indisputably real, it follows that the contradiction can be resolved only by a kind of subjection of one of the terms to the other.

From this point of view the description of the old, undemocratic régime is that therein the prevailing tendency is to ease the strain of the contradiction by discrediting the human will, and subjecting the internal order to the external, while in democratic society the opposite is the case.

IX. The unblurred consciousness of the reality of this fundamental contradiction of life is the indispensable condition of social stir and progress. Without it society lapses into stagnation. It is better, more conducive to the ultimate triumph of the principle of democracy, that the prophets of the people should despise human nature and the ideal order that it contains, than that they should deny the reality of the contradiction or hold out hopes of resolving it without a struggle.

It is more democratic, more bracing to the selfrespect of the people, that they should strive to pluck their own hearts out and fling them upon the altars of Moloch than that they should swoon away into a denial either of the reality of nature or of their own sincere desire. The popular doctrine called Christian Science undoubtedly has at the heart of it an old and familiar truth, but its affected disregard of the material world is one of the morbid signs of the times. It is the fitful recoil of a sick society from an opposite infatuation-that obsession of machinery which for a century has overwhelmed the will and enfeebled the feeling of personal existence. But social decadence follows upon every kind of denial of the reality of the historic struggle. The excesses of spiritualism are, in their practical effects, scarcely to be distinguished from those of materialism, since both alike fail to bring the affirmative ideal to bear upon the actual conditions of life. The controversies between the pure spiritualists and the pure materialists—the professionally religious and the professionally irreligious, the blind partisans of the soul and those of the

stomach—are sham battles. They have no considerable consequences, no real issues, because both parties are convinced at heart of the unreality of the task of life and the futility of human endeavor. Both alike dishearten faith and eviscerate its meaning—for the greatness of that word is in its suggestions of resistance and antagonism, its implication of the need of patience and labor.

The real battles of history are those that are fought between the aristocrats and the democrats—between those that try to give every man his deserts in due reward or punishment, and those that strive to give every man the utmost chance. For these are battles in which both parties realize that life is a strict and perilous trial-time, and that it is worth while to try—the one endeavoring to bring human nature into subjection to the nature of things; the other striving with equal resolution to subject the nature of things to the human ideal.

X. The persuasion of the superior authority of the external law is the explanation of the

dominance in undemocratic society of the abstract thinker over the worker. If the law that ought to prevail in society is conceived of as residing outside of humanity, it is inevitable that society should be ruled by those that gain a reputation as philosophers and seers. But if the legitimate authority is thought of as residing in humanity itself, then the commanding social stations must be given to such as show a practical efficiency in the subjection of nature—those that succeed best in making men at home in the world.

This is the idea that lies buried under a wilderness of cant in the praise and patronage of workingmen and the talk of the dignity of labor. Certainly there is no dignity, only indignity and shame, in reluctant and necessitous toil; but throughout the world to-day there is a dawning perception that the effective worker, in whatever way, is the true and modern idealist, the legitimate lord of life.

XI. To put the proposition of this chapter in final form: Social order presupposes the practical agreement of a controlling element of the people.

This agreement can be effected in either of two ways.

On the one hand, it is possible to get men to think alike, to defer to the same things, to hold practically identical opinions as to what is obligatory and inevitable. That is one way of establishing a social order; it is the old, undemocratic way.

On the other hand, it is possible to get men to want congruous things, possible to bring them to a concurrence of desire. It is possible to so deepen and integrate, to so sanify and purify the wills of a controlling element of the people that they shall delight in and heartily maintain a common order. This is the modern and democratic way.

It is a question, in fine, between getting people to fear similar things and getting them to have congruous desires—a question between conformity in opinions and consentaneousness of wills.

The faith of democracy is the belief that the deepest thing in the individual man is, after all, his humanity; that the wills of men are not, at

bottom, irreconcilable; that, on the contrary, the things that men want most and care most for are those that are most human and freest from the taint of privilege.

The Revolutionary Church-idea

CHAPTER IV

THE REVOLUTIONARY CHURCH-IDEA

- I. Christianity is a vast enterprise for superseding the old world-order based upon a concurrence of opinion as to what must be, whether we will or not, by a new world-order based upon a working agreement of sane and reasonable wills in the pursuit of what is desirable. The historic church is nothing other than this modern worldorder in its imperfect development, or in its failure and distraction through disloyalty to its own ideal.
- II. The root of all religions is the passion for liberty. They spring out of the crossed and thwarted will, and express the desire of the heart for a satisfaction that seems to be denied by nature and the real world. Religion is a protest against the apparently anti-human elements of the world, a defiance of the seemingly unfeeling

forces of Nature; it stands for liberty against the external law. Its witness is, immemorially and always, for the miraculous, because to the end of the world the cause of liberty must be bound up with the belief that necessity and the fixed law are not everything, that there is a chance in the universe for the sheer simple passion of the heart.

After all the subtleties of the spiritual specialists and the political philosophers, liberty can mean nothing else to an unsophisticated mind than the chance to do what one really wants to do. This primitive and inextinguishable desire of the heart set over against the antagonisms of rivals and enemies and the seeming fatality of nature, is the thing that religion has always dealt with, attempting to solve somehow the problem of liberty and to thwart or diminish the final victory of Fate.

III. Religion has two cardinal phases: it is theocratic and democratic. The social revolution consists in the conversion of men's minds from theocratic to democratic religion.

The Revolutionary Church-idea

Religion may be said to be theocratic so long as the accent of its claim for liberty rests merely upon the assertion of the liberty of God. It becomes democratic when it passes on, as by necessary inference it must at length pass on, to the proclamation of the liberty of the people.

The assertion of the liberty of God implies human liberty, for to lay hold of a god that can do as he pleases is to find at length a way of escape, albeit a fearful way, from the fatalism of the world.

The theocratic religions are provisional; they find their fulfilment in Christianity, the religion of democracy. Christianity is the religion of revolution, but since the revolution that it proposes is of so thoroughgoing a kind that it can not be wrought by any sudden violence, it is necessary that for a long while it shall appear as in process—a new polarity of social organization straining against the old.

The religion of democracy is thus not unrelated to the theocratic religions, tho it stands among them wholly unique and presenting the sharpest contrasts. It is related to them as a

faith is related to a hope out of which it has grown up, or as a child that is born is related to its embryo; there is a great difference, even a kind of reversal of all vital processes, but there is unbroken continuity.

In its historic forms Christianity is seen making its difficult way in the world through continual compromises with those fixed theocratic ideas which from the beginning have held the minds of men, and it is only in its mature and modern development that its original and essential character is fully disclosed.

The contrast between theocratic and democratic religion may be described in a great variety of ways, but the most radical description is that under the former régime the human will, or whatever lies deepest in personality, is regarded as creaturely—a made thing, partaking of the nature of Nature; while in democratic religion it is regarded as creative—a maker of things and participant in the life of the Creator.

Accordingly, theocratic religion looks upon the heart's desire of an ordinary man as naturally unauthentic and dependent for any degree of

The Revolutionary Church-idea

quasi-authentication upon the arbitrary will of God, while democratic religion declares that the heart's desire, however corrupted by lack of faith, is in its primitive character as deep and authentic as the heart of God himself.

It follows that in theocratic religions the passion of the heart-which never can die or really deny itself, whatever men may agree to say or think about it-seeks its satisfaction through some kind of compromise with the will of God. Thus the salient characteristic of all theocratic religions is the principle of sacrifice, the essence of which is the getting a part of what one cares for on condition of giving up the rest, or the getting of one's heart's desire in the future on condition that it be given up now. This way of looking at things is characteristic of all the ancient religions. It infects historical Christianity just as everything else that belongs to the old régime infects Christianity, but it has no relation to Christianity except that of stubborn opposition.

Christianity comes into the world disclaiming all compromise, and denying all need of sacrifice save the sacrifice of God in suffering so faithless a

world. It cuts with the sword of Faith the Gordian knot of the old-world social problem—declaring that the problem is insoluble to the abstract intellect, but that to the Spirit of Adventure there is no final antagonism between the external law of nature and the inmost heart's desire. It declares that a man with patience may make himself entirely at home in the universe; that it is arterial all through to the circulation of red, human blood, and that the social law is just what the will of a catholic humanity, working through the long redemptive travail of civilization, may choose to make it.

IV. The promise of this great change in the social order was a corollary of the proclamation that a man had been born who was of the same stuff as God—a proclamation that was accompanied by the assurance that any and all other men might, if they would, share the life of this man—even to the partaking of his flesh and blood.

It was by this road that the modern idea of liberty came into the world, the idea of liberty not as the privilege or accomplishment of superior

The Revolutionary Church-idea

persons, but as the right of every man in virtue of his mere humanity. For the assertion of the utter reality of liberty, its independence of all conventionality and circumstance, is in fact the same thing as to say that the spirit of man is begotten, not made; that it stands in the last accounting, not in the status of the creature but in that of the creator. This is the pivotal point of history. If a man is at last just a creature of God, the quintessence of dust, he must to the end be ruled—as all mechanisms, even the most exquisite, are ruled-by an external law. And in that case the sovereignty of government, based on the foundations of economic and defensive necessity or of an extra-rational duty or destiny, is inexpugnably established. On the other hand, if it be true that a man lives in this world, or by any purification of his soul may live, as kin of God, then for a certainty the sovereignty is to be established, even through ages of vicissitude and failure, not in brute force or necessity but in the free association of the people.

V. The Church undertakes to coordinate and

catholicize the wills of the people for the practical governance of the world. It would reduce the economic and police forces to a relation of organic subordination to the human ideal, and would abolish the infidel empire of a non-human Must or Ought.

The historic church-idea is at bottom simply the basing of civilization upon faith in the eternal nature of man and the realization of the equality of persons. It is the attempt to establish a universal social order in the spirit of democracy. The history of the Church is the story of the genesis and evolution of the American ideal.

In its original conception, the Catholic Church stands over against the old Roman empire in the same sense of contrast and contradiction that the American ideal presents to the recrudescent empires of to-day. The inner logic of primitive Catholicism was the universal demonstration of the sovereignty of the people and the subordination of secular governments to the service of human liberty. But the inner logic of a principle is of course very far from being identical with the

The Revolutionary Church-idea

shapes that it takes on when it enters into history, and attempts to get itself expressed in the alien and oppugnant elements of the world.

VI. The church-idea has suffered three principle perversions which may be named ecclesiasticism, sacramentalism, and dogmatism. These perversions are simply the diverse aspects of the Church's betraval of its own revolutionary cause under the stress of the old-world order. They are the various ways in which the principle of the sovereignty of the people has been compromised under the pressure of the opposite principle—three ways of taking the heart out of democracy, through an implied denial of the legitimacy of the common desire. What is called orthodox Christianity to this day for the most part works and speaks under one or other or all of these perversions. So that the Christ of conventional Christianity is not yet clearly disclosed as the vindicator of the principle of democratic society, but is seen rather as if unrelated to the Modern Spirit and scarcely human at all, the hierophant of a huge supernal corporation, the dispenser of

spiritual privileges or the author of a more exquisite Mosaism.

The word ecclesiasticism represents the idea that sacred interests are to be separated from such as are secular; that the Church has an existence and a mission apart from secular society. In its out-working ecclesiasticism becomes the negation of civil liberty since it denies the real and spiritual significance of secular history, reducing it to a meaningless mechanical process.

Sacramentalism, with the ideas of spiritual discipline that go with it, stands for the conception that good persons are to be separated from the bad—the old world-idea of privilege and deserts. In its outworking it becomes the negation of the democratic principle of equality. Its subtle logic justifies the sovereignty of government—regarding civil magistrates as rewarders and punishers, the arbiters of right and wrong. It undermines the fundamental democratic idea that government, however multifarious its offices, is, after all, simply a perpetual civil warfare against violence and privilege, a warfare in which every individual that wields the

The Revolutionary Church-idea

sword of civil law takes a personal and indefeasible responsibility.

Dogmatism stands for the rule of the abstract or passive intellect—the authority of the intellect over the will. It undertakes to establish social order on a propositional basis, institutionalizing the distinction between true and false propositions. Before the Renaissance and Reformation it was possible for the principle of dogmatism, with its firm leverage in ecclesiasticism, to guarantee a consistent social order, in the spirit of the old régime; but in later times it is this same dogmatism that has prevented the possibility of a coherent social order, committing the world to the endless confusions of sect and party. modern hope of a working social agreement depends solely upon the clarifying of men's wills to the attainment of a mutual reasonableness and a common and fraternal desire.

VII. Over against the sovereignty of state stands the church-idea in world-historic antithesis. The most important fact in the history of the last two thousand years is the dual polar-

ity of social organization in Christian countries, the phenomenon commonly described as the separation of the Church from the State. Always and everywhere throughout Christendom the Church has in some sense fixed its standard outside the political system, and with more or less of confidence has held that system under suspicion and correction. This separation has been most distinct among the peoples with whom the modern and democratic spirit has been most influential, and has tended toward effacement among the peoples that have been relatively unaffected by that spirit. Accordingly, the separation of the Church from the State is more pronounced in America than anywhere else, and of all nominally Christian countries, is most slight and theoretical in Russia

The phenomenon in question is peculiar to Christianity. Among non-Christian peoples the cause of religion has always been identified with that of the existing political order, and the religious offices have been regarded as functions of the state.

It is to be noted, however, that the separation

The Revolutionary Church-idea

of spiritual offices from secular offices, the distinction in character between the priest and the soldier, has always been most clearly maintained under the old theocratic régime. The principle of the separation of Church and State is not therefore to be confounded with that of the separation of sacred and secular interests. real purport is the very opposite of that. The Church is separated from the State under the claim that the old world distinction is fallacious. and that the spiritual interests of humanity are the real interests and have a right to dominate the whole range of secular life. The Church breaks from the patronage of the State and plants its standard of democracy outside the sphere of theocratic politics-determined to make a New World on eternal and spiritual principles, and to heal the old schism between sacredness and secularity.

VIII. From the beginning of the era the spiritual genius of Christianity has discerned the necessity—for the regeneration of the nations of establishing in every land a new and democratic center of social organization.

The principle of this establishment is obscured by the confusions and cross-currents of history, and nowhere does it find its ideal and perfect illustration. Nevertheless, the principle is perfectly clear. At one pole of the social life stands the sovereign government, the center of a dominating social theocracy; at the other stands the institutional organization of Christianity, the heart of inchoate democracy. As the government is not the state but only the center of the state since the state-idea comprehends the whole social system in its minutest ramifications and takes in all the people, including the knaves and traitors -so, on the other hand, the institutional organization of Christianity is not the Church; for the church-idea takes in the whole social system too, and includes all the people, even the scribes and pharisees.

The social center of gravity, the center of prevailing influence, in sovereign states falls within the government, and generally coincides with the personality of the chief executive. The power of the Church is forever drawing against the old order; its aim is, through the operation of vital

The Revolutionary Church-idea

and interior social forces, gradually to absorb and efface the principle of state sovereignty, shifting the social center of gravity to the reasonable heart of the people and superseding the masters of armies by the masters of creative forces.

IX. The church-idea is the germinal principle of this era, the key to modern history, and the spring of the evolution of democratic society. But in its intellectual definition it is itself an evolutionary product, a conception which could not possibly have been put into words two thousand years ago—or two hundred.

Ideas produce events, but events react upon ideas, shaping them to new conceptions forever more elemental, more simple. The church-idea has no abstract validity; it grows up through events, and it is rooted in an event—to wit, the life of Jesus.

The historic Christ is a sublime and representative personality around whose timeless and incomparable name are gathering through the ages the powers and graces of a rejuvenescent humanity. His convincingness is not in the tales of prodigy

that the wide-eyed child-world has woven in his story, but in his invincible reasonableness and his immense success. He is the Master of history, entrenched and bulwarked in events—the world's great banker and promoter, the capitalizer of the people's credit.

His uniqueness is not arbitrary but historical. It does not rest in the inscrutable decree of providence, but in the logical unfoldment of the drama of the ages. His faithfulness to the human ideal precipitated the long-prepared crisis of the world, and committed the nations to that all-comprehending revolution which is shifting the center of gravity of universal society from the temporal to the eternal.

The idea of a Christ exists in the very nature of thought. The world of men passes through ages of experience from slavery to liberty, from its creaturely to its creative character. The Christ-idea is the ever-growing and brightening conception of the kind of man that a free and creative man would be. This was prophecy first, then history.

As the world turned upon its moral axis from

The Revolutionary Church-idea

the old to the new régime it was inevitable that some signal personality should stand as the pivotal man. It was also inevitable that the name of that man should get itself indissolubly associated with the Christ-idea, and that his name should become the symbol of the new age and the hope of a universal humanity.

The man in whose name the principle of the sovereignty of the internal law has been won, is sure to be the first citizen of the planet as long as it shall hold its course. For this principle is the spring of all moral principles, the most intimate pulse of life. There is an intrinsic scale and hierarchy of principles, and since, in the ways of human nature, it is certain that every principle as it is disclosed and vindicated must get itself personified in a particular man, it comes to pass that the personal life that disclosed the most commanding principle of all has won an unparalleled fame and love.

But this is the surface view of the subject. Ideas are only the shadows of life; and it is no satisfactory account of the life of Jesus or of any other world-moving man to say that he stands as

the discoverer and exponent of a great idea. The more substantial fact is that he throws all men into new relations to each other. Every event has infinite consequences; the central event of history has an all-correlating significance.

Thus, all individual lives of all times are by the event of the life of Jesus dislocated from their mere natural relationships and thrown into new and spiritual relations. The old solidarities of heredity and caste are broken up and the magnetic pole of a world-wide unanimity is unchangably established.

It is in the personality of the historic Christ that the democratic revolution fixes its leverage against the sovereignty of state and the rule of economic necessity. This is the *point d'appui* of the church-idea, which could not in a million years have won any considerable credit as an abstract theory of philosophers.

CHAPTER V

THE POSITIVE ORGANIZATION OF SOCIETY

I. The historic church-idea as it rises and clears to its definition in the new age must as of old have organized expression. For the organization is of the essence of the idea. Democracy without a democratic, catholic Church is an abstraction of political philosophy and never can be realized on the plane of history. The sovereignty of the people without a concrete representation of its principle is as barren and impractical a thing as a sovereign state without a sovereign government. Political democracy, long cherished as an ideal, but hitherto disappointed of its hope and snared in the futile, changing modes of state sovereignty, must now at length in its extreme perplexity-if it would escape despair-obtain for its ideal a definite embodiment.

It is an indispensable condition of democracy that there should be a distinct organization of society apart from the sphere of politics. For society can never wield the forces of government to the ends of equality until it shall establish a standing-ground whereon to realize its existence and unity outside the governmental machine. The people, a commanding element of the population, must escape from the transcendental and theocratic conception of government, and must come to hold it with a firm grip as a thing conventional and provisional, before they can use it with masterful responsibility in subservience to the human ideal. So long as the government is looked upon as a providence and the arbiter of right and wrong, it will be the keeper of the people's conscience and the center of social organization. The military and police power, standing as a kind of sublimation of the elemental forces of Nature, will be the object of the common devotion, and in the secret corners of their souls the people will do homage to the brutegods. The principle of militarism and plutocracy does not turn upon the question of a large army

or a small one, or upon the ups and downs of trusts. It is a mental attitude, the reverence for irrational forces, in denial of the ideal. And whatever the braver spirits may do, the mass of men will continue to worship the irrational forces until such time as the forces of reasonableness shall succeed in humbling the brutalities of society with the spectacle of a serene and confident order that does not derive its title from fear of hunger or force of arms.

II. A genuine democratic society is one that does not rest upon the patriotic principle or the law-abiding habit, but upon the existence of a controlling element of the people that may be depended upon not to play the mob. It is not a question of majorities. A comparatively small minority standing together will suffice for every emergency, since with a people that live in the open air of the real world sanity is a contagion. Nor is it a question of producing a multitude of infallible persons who have perfectly subdued the mob-spirit that lurks at the bottom of every man's soul. A solid and dependable nucleus of

reasonableness may be maintained in a community in which every single member is, from time to time, a fanatic or a fool.

The church-idea is the establishing of the mag netic pole of an eternal Humanity as a rallying-point for the general reasonableness. And democracy depends not upon the perfection of any individual or class, but upon the unshakable fixity of that pole—just as theocratic society depends upon the unimpeachableness of the title of the president or king.

The realization of a genuine democratic society has waited upon the ability of the people to understand the church-idea in its simplicity, stripped of the disguises that it has been obliged to take on in order to make its way through the contradictions of the old régime.

These disguises, generalized under the names ecclesiasticism, sacramentalism, and dogmatism, have been penetrated by the light of the modern spirit one after another in the order named, and have been greatly discredited—if not altogether cast off. So it is at least with the peoples that have accepted the Reformation.

III. The principle of ecclesiasticism as a practical working-force in secular history may be said to have come to its end in the sixteenth century. Up to that time it had been of immense but, on the whole, of steadily dwindling importance.

The Church of the first three centuries exhibits Christianity swathed in its most ecclesiastical, sacramental, and dogmatic disguises. For ecclesiasticism is in principle the dissociation of the sacred order of society from the secular, and it is only incidentally concerned with prelacy or the rule of priests. It was at its maximum strength in the early Church—so strong that the spiritual order was thought of as barely touching the earth with the hem of its robe of ascension. Sacramentalism then wrought a clear breach between the saved and the lost, and dogmatism conceived of salvation as depending upon the acceptation of a few bald propositions containing the minimum of ethical rationality. From the beginning of history the Church has grown more and more secular. Thus it has grown more and more Christian, notwithstanding the scandals of the papacy and the corruptions of the cloisters.

For the decay of the things that pass away is the means of their passing.

It is to be noted that the putting away of ecclesiasticism is, in a large general way, historically and logically corresponsive with the establishment of the principle of constitutionalism. For constitutionalism signalizes the breach between the Church and the State. It is the appeal from the authority of the sovereign to the common sense of the people, an appeal which, in human nature, could never have been taken if the barons and the burghers, in the prosecution of their ordinary business as citizens of a commonwealth, had not felt themselves invested with spiritual powers in some sense superior to those of the sovereignty.

Now, constitutionalism is not democracy; it is the joining of issue with the old order in the serious struggle for democracy. Considered as a social condition it is illogical and transitional. It calls in question the sovereignty of the prince or president, but it affords no solid footing for the sovereignty of the people. Civil society can not rest permanently upon a series of legal propo-

sitions any more than the narrower domestic society, the family, can do so. In the family there must be the *patria potestas*—the unquestionable authority of the head of the house—or else free, unpledged personalities, agreeing in what is reasonable. There is no permanently tenable middle ground. And so, in civil society there can be no harmonious and self-consistent social life so long as the case stands undecided between the sovereignty of the state and the sovereignty of the people.

IV. In the United States to-day the people are bewildered with the long controversy. They have been shamed by the taunt that their government is a debilitated and crippled thing, lacking the powers that belong to the sovereignties of the Old World; and there is danger that they will give up the fight and restore to the state the panoply of sovereignty which has been stripped off in six centuries of constitutional struggle, unless there shall soon be shown a way that plain men can see, for the achievement of a commanding and unitary social order on the basis of the sovereignty of the people.

With the stripping off of ecclesiasticism, the old régime revenged itself by swathing the church-idea in new and thicker veils of sacramentalism and dogmatism.

The medieval Church had never known a spiritual discipline so sharp and devisive between man and man, or a thraidom to abstract propositions so absolute as that which marked the earlier course of Protestantism. And similarly, it is to be observed, that when, after centuries of warfare with words and blows, the sacramental-idea—the idea that religion exists to separate the faithful from the heretic—was generally discredited, then the forces of all the wrong-headedness in this world, which theretofore had made their election of two or three kinds of perversity, gathered themselves together with undiminished devotion in the redoubtable fortress of pure dogmatism.

For after all the definitions and distinctions, this word dogmatism will serve tolerably well as the roll-call of all the great delusions of the world, for it sums up the particulars of that rule of the passive intellect over the will, which is the original and universal sin.

V. The nineteenth century was the age of sudden discoveries and of vast and unpremeditated expansions of the circle of commerce. Thus the spirit of dogmatism was turned most effectively against itself in the violence of the collision between opposite schools, policies, sects, and parties.

Never before had dogmatism been so rife; never had pure intellect lorded it more insolently over the will; never had men denied more vehemently the authority of the soul, or sought more confidently for an arbitrary and non-human law that should settle all things, social and scientific. But the ages-old, unbroken spell of the passive intellect has been in these latter years subjected to a stupendous reductio ad absurdum. This Hydraheaded Unholy Ghost of dogmatism has been heard babbling its infallible oracles in a thousand jangling voices, and so at last has suffered the advertisement of its shame. The abstract intellect has discredited itself in the gloating excesses of its triumph. And in very despair of finding anywhere on earth, in school or cabinet, in sect or party, a credible external authority, men are

being driven—with whatsoever of reluctance—to believe in their own souls. It is a pity that we could not have come to the enfranchisement of Christianity on more honorable terms, but it is enough to have found the way on any terms.

VI. The gradual deepening and simplifying of the church-idea is the grand spiritual motive of the drama of the Middle Ages. The Church bred at her own breast the children of the Reformation and of modern democracy. The men of the modern spirit, the creators of what is modern in modern society, are the true champions of the Church, the continuators of the apostolic tradition.

The Reformation was not a revolt against the church-idea; it was a revolt against those impedimental elements of the medieval Church that hindered the success and progress of that idea. In the Reformation the great stream of historic Christianity, long confined within narrow, ecclesiastical limits, debouched upon the broad surfaces of secularity. Civil society itself became the successor of the medieval Church. The Protestant

sects, so far as they stood apart from the struggle for social liberty, and were conceived of as having bounds less broad than those of civil society, were but signs of the persistence of the ecclesiastical tendency. They stood, and still stand, as the evidence of an imperfect apprehension of the historic church-idea and an imperfect understanding of the character of modern society.

The medieval Church at its worst was morally commanding. It always played its part in the real and passionate world-struggle, because it always claimed a territorial jurisdiction and would not admit that any class of the people could stand outside its pale. It was always, in some effectual sense, representative of the socialrevolutionary principles of Christianity. On the other hand, it is the sufficient condemnation of the modern sects, in spite of their special virtues, that they have no vital interest in these principles. Unless, therefore, we are to suppose that the middle stream of modern tendency has been lost in the sand, we are bound to conceive of the great idea of the Christian era as seeking, in the midst of all the seething cross-currents of post-

Reformation history, a finer and truer embodiment than the Roman and Protestant sects can possibly afford.

The Reformation was the announcement of the fact that the great issue between the sovereignty of the state and sovereignty of the people could no longer find expression in the rivalries of popes and emperors. The issue passed to a new and more intimate phase, as the moral consciousness of the world reached nearer to a mastery of the moral definitions that were involved. Thenceforth the passion of the struggle lay between the institutions of the old régime, bulwarked in authority and privilege, and the upspringing life of the new nations. Here and there in diverse lands the democratic spirit found a tentative expression in the forms of national churches. But the principle is in its very nature cosmopolitan, and the national churches have proved inadequate, exhibiting a constant tendency to capitulate to kings. Thus the cause of the sovereignty of the people has been adjourned from time to time. And it has been left to the twentieth century to undertake the task of giving

definite expression to the post-Reformation conception of the church-idea.

Back of the constitutions of modern states there stands a world-wide humanity challenging the arbitrary sovereignties of government, and breathing a spirit of indomitable and expanding liberty into the lifeless letter of constitutional law.

How to give prevailing embodiment to that aspiration of the people—this is the grand problem of the new age.

VII. Americanism is not a local principle; it is a universal principle. The historic characteristic of the American spirit is its supra-nationalism, its universality. Its mission is to show that the grounds of national prosperity are in the eternal unity of things, so that the way of national self-realization breaches all the walls of protection and exclusion, and commits the national destinies to the free-flowing currents of the world. The uniqueness of this land is that it is the cross-roads where all ways meet.

Along these embracing shores and into these vast open valleys the daring spirits of the earth

have passed as into a land prepared from the beginning to be the synthesis of times and peoples. Asia and Europe were, in the creation, broken up and partitioned by large inland seas and impassable mountain walls, for the breeding of peculiar tribes and the differencing of racial experience; but America was planned as the place of the All, and its hospitable plains were spread between the two free viable oceans that the peoples might come from the corners of Nature to the discovery of the Wholeness of the World.

America has no special or provincial interests; its mission is to advance a catholic and all-containing law, to abolish the caste of climates, and make all mankind participant in the wealth of universal history. Its genius is immeasurably expansive, and if our democracy now halts and staggers at the rim of the continent and looks bewildered across the seas, it is because it is not yet wakened to its own genius. The urgence of events is pressing us to a choice between apostasy from our own ideal and the taking up of an apostolate of world-wide emancipation. We shall not fail. This is the birth-hour of a new catholicism—

the epochal moment when the Holy Spirit of the ancient Church descends from the high altars to proclaim in the market-places a fraternal world-polity and the real communion of a commerce of boundless reciprocity.

VIII. The new religious forms must grow up somehow out of the old political forms. It appears that we have been brought to such a pass in the history of this country that we can hope for no solution of our domestic political problem unless we take into consideration the whole world. Henceforth we are compelled, even in our provincial and parochial interests, to deal with universal principles. But universal principles are not political principles at all in the old sense of politics. They are religious principles. Thus politics is driven into the realms of religion and in turn religion becomes a world-polity.

In the Middle Ages the church-idea had, provisionally, a splendid embodiment, because it escaped from the jealousy of classes and stood aloof from the stress of economics. So it bided its time. By the sixteenth century the idea

had grown strong enough to descend to closer quarters with the tough world. It wrought itself into the forms of national churches and became the power of the people in the long struggle for constitutionalism and the republics. But now in the beginning of the last cycle of two millenniums we see that the idea has grown stronger still-strong enough to venture upon a descent into the very dust and passion of the world, and to seek its embodiment in the forms of a political party. This is quite in the way of the genius of the incarnation. Up from the rank soil of politics come the germinant forms of democratic catholicism, but down from the great historic heights of Christianity comes the spirit that is to inform and use them.

IX. The political party in America, regarded as a social phenomenon, is, in its external aspect and general conception, a suggestive embodiment of the church-idea. What has been lacking is, that its party-spirit should be translated into a spirit of humanity and universality. In all English-speaking countries there has been a con-

stant tendency to divide the political body into two great parties. This is a tendency directly related to the prevalence of the democratic ideal and consequently less manifest, or not manifest at all in countries that have been relatively unaffected by that ideal.

The two parties represent the democratic ideal in two opposite and mutually destructive exaggerations. And in the attritions and collisions of a deepening social experience it seems to be the destiny of these two contending spirits to discredit each other and to give rise to a non-partisan spirit, or spirit of humanity; which shall be the soul of a synthetic and universal party. In the United States this process seems now to be on the eve of its consummation. The two great organizations have ceased to represent the rival faiths of men, since they no longer have in them any considerable faith at all. Their vitality has been lost in a gradual hardening process until they have become mere mechanisms—huge Frankenstein monsters that have passed beyond the control of their creators. Their power is still enormous, but it is unvital. It is derived from

the moral passivity of the people. The party organizations are strong in the degree that the people are lacking in the conviction of ideals and possessed with the sentiment of the fatalism of the world. The politicians rely solely upon the economic forces and the fear of disaster.

The arrival of the two great political corporations at this juncture is the signal for the rise of a social organization of unexampled character. It is evident that the old corporations can not be redeemed to humanity, and it has been shown by a multitude of experiments that the people will not respond to the half-faiths of the fathers clothed in whatever allurements of new-party programs.

The people are sick of the party-spirit and weary of factional servitude; they are longing for the spirit of liberty, and the loyalties of a wider humanism.

The philosophy of the original moral constitution of the two decadent parties may be variously expounded, but in no way can the distinction between the spirit of the two systems be more simply indicated than by pointing out that it cor-

responds in a general way to the historic difference between Catholicism and Protestantism. Both are true, and both, because of their partialism, are false. And as the old Catholicism and the old Protestantism are both destined to pass away in the synthesis of a democratic catholicism, so the principles of the old political factions are to be fused in the same synthesis.

In the constitutional history of the United States the two great parties, considered together, have served in a dual and imperfect way, to effect that free association of the people, which is the sine qua non of democratic society, as a guarantee against the tendency to absolutism which is inherent in all governments. Without the great parties the general government must inevitably have stood as the center of social organization with consequences fatal to the American ideal. It is the rivalry and alternation of great and equal factions that has kept us from that oldworld idolatry of government which is the negation of the moral principle of constitutionalism. It seems that a century or more of the recrimination of rival partisan administrations was neces-

sary in order that the American people might fully escape from the shadow of the old theocracies and come to understand that a government is of human responsibility and not a gift of God. Thus the principle of party organization has stood in evident opposition to the old-world principle of the sovereignty of the state, and has indicated, in however tentative and vacillating a way, the lineaments of that democratic catholicism in which the people are to realize their existence and social unity outside the machinery of state.

The party organization, notwithstanding the poverty and partialism of its spirit, has exhibited all the formal characteristics of a true embodiment of the church-idea. If it were not for our prolonged experience of the reality of such an organization, it would be hard to prove the possibility of it. For the reality is so vital and fluent that it eludes the conceptions of pragmatical and unimaginative minds. The party organization in its normal and popular type, before it has degenerated into a mechanism, illustrates the historic church-idea in the essential particulars

that have been indicated. While being in itself no negation but a living and potent thing standing for an ideal, it may, by an accommodation of words, be described as non-ecclesiastical, non-sacramental, and non-dogmatic. This accommodation of words is not too violent, for the psychology of church and party is the same.

To begin with, then, the political party in its youth and strength does not conceive of its own organic interests as separate from the interests of the whole commonwealth, but attempts, through the attractiveness of its ideal, to establish in the midst of the commonwealth a polarity of free social organization that shall be inclusive of all public interests and magnetic to the ends of the land. The party is on the decline when it begins to be more concerned for its organization than for its mission.

In the second place the normal political party does not try to separate the good from the bad, the wise from the foolish, but invites all the people to come in their sins. When the tests of partisan orthodoxy begin to be applied and those that lack a lineage are discriminated against, the

party is passing into its mechanical stage. The appeal to class interests is the sign of dissolution.

Finally, the party organization, in its original type, rests confidently upon the unformulated reality of its general ideal. It makes and abrogates platforms and programs according to the exigencies of times, but refuses to be ruled by precedent and definition. It is not dogmatic. It is only in the moribund phase of its existence that the councils of a great political party are ruled by scribes and pedants that ring the changes upon the formularies of the past.

Of course, no political party was ever for a moment free from the human qualities that the words ecclesiasticism, sacramentalism, and dogmatism stand for. The point is that these qualities are not the strength of the party but its weakness. The study of the history of the political parties therefore settles the question as to the possibility of establishing a wide social organization, a democratic catholicism, on a basis altogether different from that on which the existing sectarian churches stand.

It proves that an effective and continuous organization can be maintained on sheer ideal grounds without reliance upon successions, sacraments, or dogmas.

X. The political party has only faintly fore-shadowed the organization of catholic democracy. And the faintness of the type has been due not only to the fact that it has been partisan, but also to the fact that it has been distinctively political. The genius of democratic society can not breathe its full breath in an atmosphere pervaded by politics, for the subordination of the forces of politics to the uses of a free and creative humanity is of the essense of democracy.

In the old order of the world the cultivation of the humanities depends upon the political organization, but in the new order the political organization depends upon the cultivation of the humanities. The old régime begins with law and order, and strives for liberty; the new begins with liberty, and strives for law and order.

The great men of letters of the nineteenth century announced the discovery that fine art has

its roots in morality and law. They did much to close the gap between the humanities and the common life. But the true account of the matter seems to be that morality and law have their roots in fine art. The Church of the twentieth century, therefore, will better the instruction of the wise men of the nineteenth, and will make the free, creative life of the people, the life of fine art, the sole basis and reliance of civil law. The political parties have lost their vitalities and have become machines because they have permitted their interest to be absorbed in a machine, the machine of government. The solution of the political problem, which is simply the problem of vitalizing and humanizing the governmental machine, is seen to lie in a social-political organization which has time for politics every day, but lays the accent of its interest upon the dignity and grace of ordinary living.

Politics will continue to be a game of politicians so long as the people attend to it only once in a while. There is need of a political primary that shall be always in session, and there is need of a fertile, flowering soil of humanity that shall

Positive Organization of Society

send a steady stream of vital sap up into the gnarled and withering limbs of law.

XI. It is to be supposed that the externals of religion are about to undergo a great change. The symbols of a half-theocratic Christianity can not be taken as sufficiently expressive of the religion of democracy. The old church architectures must give place to types that are indigenous to the soil at liberty—types more magnificent than those of the Middle Ages, since the resources of modern art and commerce are more. And the prisoned artists must break out of the mills to forge the world into human shape and make the cities fit for souls. The sovereignty of the people is only plain speech for the kingship of the Son of Man. The old world-church dedicated its architectural glories to this idea and the new world-church is likely to do the same. The time may be near at hand when the church in a country-town will be as grand as the court-house or the jail.

Democratic religion will produce new types, but the old will not be despised. Its principle of

universality relates not only to space but to time. The Church which stands for the humanity of all lands will stand also for the humanity of all the centuries. The people will always respect the plebiscite of the ages. But great uniformities are cheap. It is easy and always has been easy to get men to go in crowds to worship at the shrine of a beauty which they do not see, and can not, because they go in crowds. We must commit ourselves frankly to our great enterprise; we are bound to break up the good customs that are corrupting the world and give the sweet spirits of the Hours a chance to flourish in the sunlight.

XII. The Church is destined to pour its life into the university. The university, as it exists in the United States, is a nondescript thing, mortgaged to the past and reaching aimlessly toward the future. It is partly a monastic survival, partly a subsidized supporter of social privilege, partly a trades-school, partly a proprietary institution for the propagation of private opinions, and partly a hopeful prophecy of what is to come.

Positive Organization of Society

Now the university, in its original and final definition, is the stronghold of the affirmative and creative intellect. The university-idea is the bringing of the whole of knowledge punctually to bear upon this present place and moment. But knowledge has no wholeness to the merely passive mind—is only a collection of irrelevant details, a medley of useless curiosities. It acquires a wholeness and the university-idea becomes realizable only when the intellect is penetrated with faith and actuated by the passion of the human ideal.

The university was born out of the body of the church and suckled at her breast. In its youth it rose up and destroyed ecclesiasticism. Its work for the future is to continue the life of its mother. These institutions of dubious learning that we have, smooth protegés of millionaires and half-starved step-children of the state, are doubtless something, and may be given a name, but they are not universities. The spirit of the university can not grow otherwise than out in the open air in daily venture of its life.

The segregation of thinking men was a medi-

eval and monastic idea. It suited the genius of ecclesiasticism. For the times that are coming, it is well enough that the technical school should lodge its expensive apparatus in some safe and accessible spot, but the university must go with the Church to the people. The talk of academic liberties is vain. Where and when was thinking and speaking ever free to those that rested in vested rights, or unfree to those that would pay the price? And in all reason how can the world be expected to assure an income to those that break its idols? The people should write on the pediments of the churches for the admonition of their teachers: We are foolish children and may stone you, but we implore you to speak the truth.

XIII. Out of the struggling soul of Christianity have come the three cardinal institutions of the existing social order: The political party, the sectarian church, and the organization of learning summed up in the university. These three things in their rise, their growth and their predestined decay and supersession, may be best

Positive Organization of Society

understood if regarded as the partial and exaggerated forms of the protest of the democratic spirit against the old régime.

These institutions can give real and permanent effect to their several protests, and realize their own ideals by dying and pouring their life into the profound and simple synthesis of a democratic catholicism—the positive organization of society.

The political party protests against ecclesiasticism. In its ideal it is the assertion of the all-importance of the real and present world of living men. It affirms the moral dignity of material civilization as involving all the spiritual issues. It turns its face resolutely away from the world of ghosts and metaphysical abstractions, holding nothing sacred that is not secular, and declaring that the free and ideal life is to be lived here and now. But it fails to apprehend the spiritual principle of liberty. It is shallow, and its shallowness means onesidedness and futility in the struggle for civil liberty. It becomes sacramental and dogmatic—the instrument of privilege and the slave of formularies. It ends by the negation of

its own original principle in a thirst for an uneconomical—a transcendental—glory.

The sectarian church, as idealized in the minds of the people, stands to-day as the protest of the modern spirit against sacramentalism and as the assertion of the primacy of the principle of charity or fraternity. It will not any longer separate the deserving from the undeserving. It declares that brotherly love will solve all problems. But the virile heart is not in it. Its Christ has only a soul of soft sentiments and pity. It does not believe in liberty or the creative spirit of man. Its fraternity is superficial and unconvincing. And in its conscious weakness it has recourse to a recrudescent ecclesiasticism and dogmatism which is less convincing Its extremity is the denial of its own specialty; and the crowds gather in the streets to accuse the churches of partialism and caste, and to pass resolutions that their charity is a sham.

Finally, the university stands as a protest against dogmatism, the last of the triple Fates. It maintains, as its point of honor, the freedom

Positive Organization of Society

of the intellect. But the university also is without that faith which is the life and breath of the modern spirit. It does not yet understand that science is impossible to the passive intellect; its soul is still thralled in the superstition of arbitrary law.

In its eagerness to escape from the foul spirit of dogmatism, it flies for refuge to an ideal world and to the strongholds of privilege. And in the end it falls into the arms of its aversion—it becomes the mouthpiece of tradition and prejudice, and announces fixed opinions with the fearful unanimity of caste.

XIV. In a true and searching psychology the great trinity of errors is reducible to a unity—to wit, the original sin of dogmatism—the rejection of the creative authority of life itself in the prepossession of arbitrary and irrational law. When the rejection is complete, and the superstition unlighted by a single gleam of faith, there is no room for any other error, and the world lies prostrate with an utter passivity of intellect in the thralldom of an unmitigated despotism. But

in the gloaming light of half-faiths the mind reacts against this abject servitude, and ventures to search for a law which, while not related to the heart of man, or answering his sincere desire, may yet serve to break the force of an entirely irrational tyranny. It is thus that the other two cardinal phases of falsehood come into play. These are two, not one, because a man with a half-faith is two men. He is drawn hither and thither by the seesaw of the ineradicable passion of his heart and the unescapable fact of the external world. He is by turns an a priorist and an a posteriorist. He is torn between the rival fanaticisms of spiritualism and materialism. In his endeavor to escape from despotism he seeks a saving law, now in his pale etiolated conscience and now in the hard, mechanical order of the material world. The former tendency produces the ultra-spiritualism of religion, the latter the ultra-materialism of politics.

But the splitting process does not stop with a single fission; for the morbid dualism of the heart-contemning intellect is a force that is constantly operative. As soon as it has wrought

Positive Organization of Society

one schism, cleaving the whole of life into two parts, it sets to work on each of the parts to make two more—and so on. Religion becomes on the one hand ecclesiastical, interested in the construction of a purely spiritual state, and on the other hand sacramental; for sacramentalism is merely materialism stated in ecclesiastical language. Ecclesiasticism in its turn becomes, on the one hand, an a priori Protestantism, and, on the other, an a posteriori Romanism. Then Protestantism bifurcates into the abstract logic of Calvin and the literalism and traditionalism of Luther—and so forth, to the end of the long catalog of religious sects.

Starting with the other term of the original schism, we might trace in the history of politics the same process. However, there is a constant tendency, more or less strong, according to the common sense of the people, to clear up the complication and reduce the difficulty to its original terms. And there is a natural congeniality of extremes—the rule of sentimentality being the rule of the stomach. In this way things get simplified.

But the aim here is to point out that all the perplexities and contradictions of the social order have their spring in the principle of dogmatism. It follows that the particular social institution that is conceived of as specially antagonistic to this principle must afford a strategic point from which to attack the general confusion.

The university, therefore, holds the key of the situation. To carry out the university-idea in the forms of politics and in the spirit—the faith—of historic Christianity—that is in general terms the solution of the problem of the positive organization of society.

CHAPTER VI

THE AXIOMS OF THE AFFIRMATIVE INTELLECT

I. The rejection of dogmas does not mean the denial of creeds. A generation of men can not go forth to the remaking of the world without great definitions, exact and rigorous principles. Not by faith alone, or by any power or passion of the soul, can the world be put in order. For order is a principle of the intellect; and it is the intellect, renewed and empowered by the confident will, that must plan the structure of the world-cities.

The old creeds are nothing to us so far as they rest upon authorities, but they are passwords to the future if they answer the heart's desire.

II. Now Christianity is not a peculiar creed resting upon authority; it is the historical development of the affirmative intellect. All the great doctrines of the Church are implicit in the fact of faith itself.

Given a thinking man face to face with death, disease, and the cruelties and contradictions of the world, and if he does not succumb to the stress and strain and become half-hearted, but adheres with faithfulness to the law of his own life, then the great doctrines of the catholic creeds will be discovered to lie bedded in the very structure of his mind, tho he may never have heard of Jesus or considered the theories of the theologians. The simple truth is that the catholic faith is the very breath of human desire, the life of life itself.

Now faith is cheap to children, to people that do not think, and to prosperous people of small sympathy. It is none the less genuine in such persons, but faith of such a degree is not constructive because it is not intellectual. It contains no answer to the problems of the defeated or to the disquietudes of those that think and feel in wide horizons.

From the beginning the social structures have been built by men of comparative strength of mind who, because they were men of intellect, could not believe in life as children and the unseeing do. Thus the social structures have been built in unfaith. The whole scheme of social law from immemorial times has been warped to the conceptions of a passive and faithless intellect.

Into such a world-order comes Christianity, with its proclamation of the principles of faith—the chief and summary things that a man wants to believe and is bound to believe if he would maintain the sincerity of the universe, the reality of his personal existence, and the practicability of his own ideal. They are not propositions to think about or talk about, to argue to or argue from. As propositions addressed to the mere reflectiveness of men, it matters not at all whether they be rejected or accepted. They are not the flower or fruit of intellect, but the root and sap; not forms of right thinking, but the formal vindication of the right to think.

The emancipation of the intellect for the work of building a social order on the plan of the human ideal became a possibility and an expectation when first a man grounded his consciousness in the Eternal, and gained strength of heart

to say that the laws were for men—not men for them. This was to demand a reversal of all the social currents; it put the will above the understanding, and located the seat of authority within the soul. Of course, the flood swept over this man, but it could not submerge him—for the heart of the world was secretly with him.

III. The historic mission of Christianity has been the establishment and assurance of the affirmative intellect. The assumption that men can be saved by the acceptance of right forms of thinking is precisely the fundamental assumption of that ancient order into which Christianity came as an alien and opposite thing. The history of the pre-Reformation Church is, on the whole, the story of a magnificent struggle for intellectual liberty against the superstitions of barbarians and the dogmatisms of Judea, Greece, and Rome.

There is not a single dogma of the Church that does not contain the antidote to its dogmatism—an implication of the subordination of dogmas to the principle of faith. The dogmas of the Church

are all doctrines of liberty clothed in such terms as to render them not utterly repugnant and incredible to a world thralled in the prepossessions of fatalism, skepticism, and social slavery. And there is not a single great primary institution of the Church—as baptism, the holy communion, the episcopate—that does not in its original conception and practise contain an implied denial of the old-world idea that society depends upon established institutions. In the minds of its clearer spirits the Church was never an institution: it was the maker and unmaker of institutions.

The formulation of Church doctrines and the setting up of the Church's institutions was always a pressingly practical matter as to how best to commend to a servile and insensate world the spiritual principle of self-government and the authority of the internal law.

The radical thing in Christianity is the consubstantiality of a man with God. This was dramatized and pressed upon the credit of men in the sublime formularies of Nicene theology. The doctrine of the Trinity is the imper-

ishable charter of human liberty. It is the very arrogance and insolence of faith, the taunt of the confident will flinging its defiance to formal logic in the proclamation that God shall be true to Himself and Man shall be true to himself, and yet the Spirit of Order shall prevail and the Holy City shall be built!

The inner logic and inevitable social consequence of unitarianism, or pure monotheism, is despotism. The human spirit must set its stake in the eternal if it would win the world to civil liberty. So long as everything can be settled by a cry of "God wills it," or "Great is Allah," there is no chance for democracy. It is necessary to demonstrate the Eternity of the Human—the absolute Authority of the Soul.

The Greeks achieved a shallow and conventional kind of liberty by filling their Olympus with divinities that were frivolous—and so could be laughed down. The Jews accomplished the same thing—cleared a little space for the sincerely human—by making a contract with Jehovah and holding him strictly to it. But a real and universal social liberty was not so much as

conceivable until the name of the Son of Man was shrined in an equal and ineffable greatness with the name of God, and not until the relation between the two was conceived of as no captious rivalry or hard bargain but a profound and spiritual kinship which gave a man the charter of eternity in following out to the last definition the prompting of his own humanity.

Indissolubly associated in ancient theology with the doctrine of the Trinity is the doctrine of the duality of nature and singleness of personality in the Son of Man. This, too, is implied in the very principle of faith. For faith is faith only when it faces a contradiction and a difficulty; and the doctrine in question is a frank avowal that the divine image has feet of clay. It is a manly recognition of the fact that, in a certain broad aspect of his existence upon the earth, a man is creaturely—a victim and subject of circumstances. It affirms that life is a real struggle of the creative spirit against the fatality of the world—for the realization of integral personality.

Finally the great doctrine of the Reformation—that of justification by faith only—is simply a

somewhat scholastic announcement of the broad principle in hand—to wit, that all the great and saving doctrines of Christianity are implied in the very fact of faith itself.

IV. The history of the post-Reformation era is the history of the gradual translation of the transcendent creed of earlier Christianity into more ethical and practical terms.

The doctrines of the Church become the fundamentals of secular society—Christianity merges into democracy. The creed of democracy, like its original, is merely an exfoliation of the principle of faith. It may be conveniently summarized in the historic formula—Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

Liberty, in the definite democratic-revolutionary sense of the word, means that common human life has an original and creative character and is the source of all moral authority. It negatives the distinction between sacred and secular interests, and denies the theocratic authority of the Church and the sovereignty of the State. It is the modern and democratic unfoldment of the

The Axioms

Christian doctrine of the consanguinity of a man with God. It has no affinity with the ancient Greek idea of conventional and acquired liberty, and it was grossly misconceived by Rousseau and the French Revolutionists in their theory of the absolutism of majorities.

V. The doctrine of equality is the sequence of the doctrine of liberty, since, however greatly men may differ in their creaturely endowments, the creativeness which is attributed to all men is a thing in its nature miraculous and infinite, baffling all standards of comparison. As a working hypothesis equality means that however low a man may fall in the scale of success he never forfeits his rights to an equal consideration with the highest in the scale. It means that in a democracy the law must utterly refuse to consider the question of the relative deserts of men. It has no competency to bestow titles of nobility or pass bills of attainder; it can utter no word of praise or blame. The penal code exists not to punish those that are adjudged to be bad, but simply to defeat those that seem to threaten the

common life. The whole system of government and law is conceived of as a perpetual crusade in the interest of liberty—a crusade in which there is no blind obedience to a mystic authority, but every citizen bears the sword of law as a personal responsibility.

Equality as a principle of jurisprudence works a revolutionary change in the spirit of laws, and gradually readjusts the forms and ordinances of the old static codes to a new and dynamic conception of human rights. The old codes were conceived and wrought out in the prepossession that man is himself a creature and commodity of God, a mere *thing*—albeit the highest. Accordingly they approach every juristic question from the standpoint of things—they are riveted to the proprietary point of view.

The cry of the oppressed and disinherited for an equality of possessions is the echo of the sordidness and stupidity of the ancient masters of the law. The question of the equality or inequality of goods is an impertinence—it has nothing to do with the real issue. And the code of a democratic equality will refuse to be a divider

until the real and important question has been answered—namely, this: Does the proposed measure make for the creative life of the lowest man concerned? If it does, then no title or vested interest, tho it were very clear and long, should stand for a moment in the way. If a statute degrades anybody it is *ipso facto* void. The doctrines of liberty and equality issue from a perception that there is a life in men that is incommensurable with commodities, so that no proprietary title can be good in law that does not make for life.

Democratic law is not a deduction from the principles of nature—it knows nothing of the "Natural Rights of Man"; it is a work of fine art, and its concern is with the spiritual and creative rights of men. It holds that wealth—material welfare—consists only in a very limited and secondary way, in the owning of things—that it consists principally in the power to vitalize things with the forces of ideas. The absorbing interest of democratic political economy is the releasing of the ideal forces to their maximum efficiency. The matter of ownership, however

important, is distinctly subordinate, and, from a democratic point of view, presents no grave perplexities, but tends to settle itself on the general principle that the tools belong to the man that can use them.

VI. Turning now to the final term of the democratic formula, the principle of fraternity is by no means to be taken as a mere sentiment of sociability. Like the principle of equality, it is a profound and spiritual corollary of the primary postulate of liberty. It is born of the cool sanity of faith, and no ardor of good-fellowship can possibly attain to it. It faces the problem of the collision of wills. Men strive for conflicting objects—how then can social order be established? The old régime solved the problem by denying the validity of all private and personal wills; in the theory of the sovereign state the wills of rulers and ruled alike are subjected to an external and transcendent authority. Christianity, democracy, looks for a solution in the opposite direction. It declares that the collision of wills, the pursuit of conflicting purposes, is born of the faithlessness and shallowness of our living; that in the bottom of men's hearts there is a congruity of desires, a harmony of all individual interests. This is the doctrine of fraternity. Like all the articles of the Christian and democratic faith. it is incapable of expression in terms of the passive intellect. It is an axiom, but it is an axiom of faith. It is the ground of our confidence that, in the passing away of the old social order and the discrediting of the authorities upon which that order has depended for social peace, we are not committing the world to anarchy and the mere lawless and malignant strife of rival egotisms. It is the reasonable basis of our expectation that an efficient government and a law of world-wide prevalence can be established on the basis of free and uncapitulating wills-the consent of the people.

The perfect triumph of democracy is to get the knaves to consent to the jail and rejoice in it. Meanwhile the sincere and unsentimental collision of will is the purifying travail of the world. And Evil is anything that breaks the spirit of a man and makes him cringe to another.

VII. As the spiritual principle of democracy will not permit the subjection of one man's will to another's, neither will it allow the subjection of the individual will to the sum total of other wills. Democratic fraternity is not the confusion of all private and personal interests in a huge and overwhelming public interest; that is the fraternity of the old social order which is passing away—it is the fraternity of clans and races, the fraternity whose bond is hereditary and of the flesh. The social solidarities whose cohesive force is the instinct of heredity, a kinship of blood, are mutually repulsive in proportion to the energy of their interior cohesion—they can not therefore produce a world-order. The irrational lust of heredity, the agglutinousness of races, is of the essence of the world-problem, and it contains in itself no hope of solution. One must leave father and brother if one would enter into the fraternity of the modern spirit. Democracy lifts its standard against all the old solidarities, and proclaims a kinship that is not of flesh. The consanguinity of democracy is not carnal but spiritual. It is a transfusion of the blood of God, a communion in the Eternal Human. The old solidarity must be dissolved in order that the opposite principle, the principle of unanimity, may be established.

VIII. Democracy stakes everything on the individual, because the individual is the universal. The faith of democratic fraternity is that if one go deep enough into any man's heart one will find that the passion of his life issues out of the Eternal Reasonableness and Justice; and the travail of history and experience is to bring men to unity and to universal humanity by bringing them to themselves. From the beginning of civilization the world has been governed by the mass-man, the mob. The principle of individuality, though it has been the power of all literature and art, and the charm of all chivalry and song, has hitherto played no considerable part in the affairs of state. Theocracy can produce only crowds and classes: the dominance of an external law can never produce individuals. Mass-man and class-man are interchangeable terms, and individuality and universality are interchangeable terms.

In the constitution of human nature, it is impossible to accomplish the individualization of the soul without universalizing it. A man can not possibly have a clear, unitary, and persistent will of his own until he has given himself unreservedly to a design that is creative in the service of humanity. As one grows in consistency and persistence of desire, one grows in sanity and usefulness. The laws of the material universe are all drawn in favor of the sane and integral will of the individual—the eternal passion of the heart. And they are framed for the confusion of all prurience and lust. The patience and persistence of Satan is a Miltonian myth. It would seem that the true and typical Prince of Sin should be a soul with a shattered and divided will, not half for good and half for evil, but half for his crowd and half for himself-thus working the damnation of his crowd and of himself.

No man can abolish his heart's desire, tho he may indeed be persuaded to the attempt by much preaching of social sacrifice and by the lures of glory. The truth about the mass-man as evinced

by his patriotism and class-feeling, his sectarianism and party-spirit, is that he is balked of his individuality by his half-hearted altruism. He can not achieve an intelligent will or a sober judgment because his mind is divided between the law of his clan and that of his own soul. His loyalty becomes a sentimentality or a fanaticism, and his desire, a preposterous lust of gain or glory. So the social system of the massman is ruled by fine theories—and sheer hunger. Then when the cry of the fainting and crushed goes up, the preachers go through the land pleading with the people to give their wills into the keeping of new sects and parties—which serves only to increase the confusion and bewilderment, refining the fine sentiments and strengthening the secret lusts.

IX. Democratic philosophy squarely joins issue with the current conception of the organic character of political society. The organic idea is the fetish of the age, the modern form of the ancient superstition of nature-worship. The inevitable logic of the conception is the efface-

ment of the individual, the subjection of the part to the whole. And the conception requires for its completion the idea of a huge social Oversoul or corporate personality, an idea that is utterly mystical and unreal when applied to a local and particular commonwealth. It creates a world of warring gods, and commits the people to the dominance of mere physiological law and the economic forces. For how can a feature or a finger resist the whole bulk of a body? And how can one who is only a member of an organism do anything interesting until he has got every rib and tissue to agree to it? Moral enterprise becomes a problem for specialists, and agitation a disease. Nobody can do anything until everybody is ready to do it. A society that continues to lie under the spell of this superstition is devoted to death—or a reign of reviving deviltry. For society is not an organism; it is an organization.

It is indeed possible to say, by a figure of speech, that mankind becomes an organism as it comes to its humanity and realizes its relationship to God. This simile came from the Man of

Nazareth, and it has played a great part in the history of the Church. It serves to emphasize the intimacy of human relationships in the realm of the ideal. But it is only a figure of speech, and like many another figure of the same immortal speech it has been wrested to false meanings. It has been woven into the superstition of transubstantiation. And there is no fitter characterization of this modern theory of social organism than to say that, in its psychology, it is a newer version of high-church sacramentalism. It hushes all questionings with its "Hoc est corpus." It overawes the individual with the mystery of majorities—it is the elevation of the Host—the adoration of the Mass.

X. In contrast with the doctrine of social organism, democracy sets up its axiom of fraternity—a fraternity which is not a matter of heredity, contiguity, or material interest, but depends for its bond upon the communion of men in reasonableness.

It is in the depths of personality that democracy discovers its social principle—its principle of

universality. True it is, that so long as democracy is conceived of as a matter of the wider extension of the balloting practise, it contains no necessary implication of universalism and no negation of the sovereignty of separate and mutually exclusive states. For, as has been pointed out, the strength of the old world-governments—even the most despotic—has been in the support given by majorities. They all have made their appeal to the mass-man. But in spite of the shallowness of political philosophy and the general inarticulateness of mankind, democracy has always meant in the common sense of the people infinitely more than this.

It means, and has always meant at bottom, not that majorities shall have their unquestioned way, but rather the opposite—to wit, that the individual has a right that no masses of men shall be permitted to override. The quintessence of democracy is the legitimizing of the will of the weakest man and the championing of his claim against the fanaticism of masses and the arrogance of an external and arbitrary law. It conceives of the wills of the multitude as all

alike growing out of the will of God, and as deepening back through the discipline of life and the attritions of human commerce to their root in the Eternal Desire. It announces the equality of persons, not as a proposition in mathematics but as a disclaimer of the human possibility of fixing the gradation of deserts.

The democratic principle does not require that men should eat and sleep together or wear each others' clothes. Its catholic charity proceeds from that which is discovered to be the source of all law and dignity upon the earth—the immeasurable souls of ordinary men.

It is this democratic conception of the final authenticity of the individual desire that is undermining the old systems of traditional law, disintegrating the solidarity of the great political aggregates, and discrediting the sovereignty of states. And this is the conception that gives to democracy its character of universality.

The vigor of democratic polity is in democratic religion. So long as the American people would make their citizenship a privilege as against the rest of the world, they will be ridden over rough-

shod by domestic monopolies. For American citizenship is not a privilege; it is a propagandum.

The great psychological discovery of Christianity is that, back of every private and egotistical will, there is in every man a deeper and more indigenous will that is public and catholic. The claim of Christianity—and so of democracy—is that the individual will is not a bad thing capable of being made good, but a good thing capable of being made bad. In its bold declaration of the legitimacy of the heart's desire it makes a venturesome appeal from that in human nature which is accidental and acquired to that which is deepest and most essential.

Now it is the ancient conception of the badness of the natural will that bases and sanctions every scheme of class-privilege and national exclusiveness. Given the conception that the will is essentially illegitimate—that it is endowed with a merely potential goodness—and it becomes inevitable that the relative value of the souls of men will be judged by a standard external to themselves. The demonstration of power will be regarded as a proof of right, economic success

will bestow a moral prestige upon the successful, and the winning of a crown will cure defect of title. The social law throughout its whole extent will be warped to a conformity with this primary prepossession, and in spite of the formal equity of the law it will be found practically impossible to construe it otherwise than in the special interest of the prevailing nations and classes.

It is a total misconception of the nature of class and national privilege to suppose that it can rest and enjoy its spoils on a basis of sheer frank aggression or good luck. The aggression would be repressed as criminal and the luck would be canceled by law if the people did not—in a more or less conscious way—attribute to the successful a superior moral desert. And in spite of the promptings of self-interest, the defeated can not, at the bottom of their fearful hearts, do otherwise than attribute to the successful a superior moral desert so long as they worship a non-human god, and think of the will as legitimized only through conformity with an external rule of good and evil.

Hence no people can break the reign of fatality

or by any means escape from the yoke of military and economic despotism so long as they deny the legitimacy of the will of the brownest or blackest man on the other side of the world. They may impose terms, but they are bound to deal with him as an equal person; the demand for his unconditional surrender is a moral absurdity.

Under the sway of state sovereignty it is possible for a people to claim and successfully maintain their various class privileges and conventional deserts under the sovereign law, without claiming equal rights for an alien and subjugated people. The subjugated race then becomes simply a part of the lowest and most unprivileged class in a social order that is penetrated through and through with the spirit of monopoly. But it is not possible for a nation to maintain the principle of the sovereignty of the people, the principle of the unconventional authority of the soul, without maintaining the legal equality of all souls.

It is morally impossible for a man to believe in the legitimacy of his will, as a thing existing in its own original right, apart from the accidents of his social and material condition, without conceding a like legitimacy to the wills of all other men of whatever condition. The principle of individuality is thus the exact equivalent of the principle of universality. If you are protestant enough you will be a catholic, and to be a thorough-going American is to be a citizen of the world.

XI. We have found that the essentials of the historic creed of Christianity are all implicit in the mind of any man that has determined to make the adventure of faith, determined to risk the reasonableness of the cosmic world, the sincerity of God, and the practicability of the ideal. We have found also that the great historic creed of democracy—summed up in the formula: Liberty, Equality and Fraternity—is simply a more ethical and practical unfoldment of historical Christianity, and that, like its original, it is contained in the very fact of faith.

The axioms of these creeds are neither mathematical nor what is called scientific. They can not be justified to the criticism of moral cowardice.

There is no way of proving their truth to the mere critical intelligence. They are true only in case the primary assumptions of brave living are true. They are contingent axioms-contingent upon the presumption that life is worth while. But they are axioms-invincible and necessary propositions—in the sense that there is no escape from them. Von are bound to reckon with them. You must risk their being true or else give up the affirmation of your own soul and die a deserter. These are the terms upon which life upon the earth must be lived. It seems that God has concealed himself from the searchings of the unventuresome intellect. The cunningest detectives, ranging the earth for ten thousand years, have not been able to find an indubitable footprint of him. Nature is beautiful? Yes, to the brave and free; not otherwise beautiful. Every external fact is double-faced-you may construe it in the way of love or terror.

Thus through the long sifting and simplifying processes of history and experience we have reduced religion to its simplest terms—have found out the quintessence of religion, the

religion absolute. It is summed up in a magnanimity of the soul toward God—a quick response to the divine compliment that has put the world in our keeping. God has withdrawn himself to give us room. The end of the long world-process is seen to be not the assimilation of all lives to an archetypal life, but the infinite differentiation of life in the unity of God. We will not huddle any more, but we strike hands with free and indomitable spirits of all times and countries.

There come drifting in upon us the most convincing reassurances. The earth becomes plastic to the ideal. The languages fuse into a *volapük* of faith. All the historic struggles are seen to have a common issue. There is nothing anywhere that moves and sings, that is not a part of the great epic of the soul.

The religion of democracy is not new or newly discovered. It is the master-motive of the whole historic drama. The victoriousness of the free and fluent spirit over the hard elements of the world is the theme of all enduring literature and the energy of all creative art. It is also the

esoteric ideal of the social force and fashion, the beau monde of all ages and of all lands; for the beau monde has always affected at least to measure men by their courage and to care little for clothes and furniture. It never would be ruled by etiquette. It makes fashions, but passes on and does not follow them; expects every man to answer for his love with his life, and would impoverish the soil and the seas for the sake of human reverence and hospitality. Democracy comes out of Nazareth, but it does not learn its lessons from the stupid. It is the lyric song of ancient chivalry, deepened and exalted to a world-symphony. It is the ideal of the old nobilities, sobered by science and the economic facts. It is the romance of the ages, with the sentimentality cleaned out. For the soul of chivalry, nobility and romance is the contempt of laws and of all earthly things, except as they make for the freedom and dignity of persons.

In a word, there is nothing in this world that is great or half-great that has not been the product of the affirmative intellect. All the lines of great tradition converge in the heart of democracy. Out of the close courts and cloisters, the libraries and galleries of the old régime, democracy in perennial youth comes into the open air to take up the burden of the world. The old faiths die and faith is born—a faith now at length grown self-conscious and aware of its world-revolutionary implications.

XII. The university has also a creed, and as the creed of religion and politics issues out of the simplest affirmation of faith, so it is with the creed of the university. The modern university is not a school of dialectics and speculative philosophy; it is related only by contrast to the Academies and Museums of antiquity. history of learning shows a clear breach between the ancient and the modern world. The ancient school exhausted the possibilities of the passive and reflective intellect, and after the intervention of the long, silent ages of early Christianity, the university grew up, in the nurture of the Church, with an ideal in its heart that is the antithesis of the ancient scholastic ideal. is true that the medieval university used the

books of the ancient world, and mimicked the methods of the rhetoricians and sophists of Greece, but the world's intellectual ideal had turned the crisis of a revolutionary change. Henceforth the currents of human thinking were set in a new direction. Anselm's "I believe—in order that I may understand!" was a word that could have been spoken only by a man of the modern spirit. It marks the turning of the tide.

To the ancient man thinking was an exercise that had no necessary relation to the facts of the universe. It was a variety of mathematics, the algebra of ideas. To the man of the modern spirit thinking is a wrestle with things; it is the tense struggle of the soul to get its bread and wine out of this stubborn, tempting, denying, and inviting wilderness of nature. In the ancient man's thinking there was no need of moral adventure—one had but to lie still and look up at the ceiling; but the thinking that is characteristically modern begins and constantly continues in the buoyant, risky assumption, which never can be fully verified until the day of judgment, that it is possible to find the complete,

resplendent aura of the ideal in the very dust of the obdurate earth.

In the old world thinking was respected for its leisure, but in the modern world for its labor. Thinking becomes the divine travail of the soul. We are led to surmise that God made the world resistant, and laid his fond anathema upon the soil, in order that in the real and passionate struggle for the things that taste sweet to the soul, a man might be raised from creaturehood and become a man. The old world has bequeathed to us heads bereft of hands, and hands bereft of heads; and the bitterness of death lurks equally in both bereavements. The old world has thus posed a problem which, in the way of its statement, has no possible solution. There can be no communion except that of compassion and patronage between creative men that think and human creatures, if such there can be, that iust hew and moil. It is a mad dream that hands can dictate terms to heads, and the maddest dream of all that hands can dispense with heads and run the world without them. The only effective and wage-earning labor in the world is

spiritual—the toil of the feeling, knowing, creative spirit. The movement of muscles may be as painful as the contortions of fever and as useful as the trade-winds; but it is not human labor unless it is actuated by free human hearts and heads. The real and economic values of the coarsest and simplest work are in the ideal forces that go into it. And if there be anywhere a dead soul whose body has been riveted to a machine, his grievance is, not that he gets less pay than he deserves, but that he is excluded from human company and deprived of the chance to be humanly useful.

When a man is reduced to the state of a thing, an analysis will show that he makes no contribution whatever to the civilizing wealth of the world. His very person becomes merely an embodiment of the blind forces of nature. He ceases to be a social producer and becomes a social problem.

The old régime despised the brain-worker, the concrete thinker, and gave its honors to glory-seekers—the soldiers and the priests. The rise of the third estate to the rule of the modern

world was inevitable in the nature of things, since those that deal with realities are stronger than those that live in dreams. But that third estate - the merchants, manufacturers, civilizers-have in turn submitted their minds to the domination of the lingering political and ecclesiastical superstitions, and have sought to reconstitute the old order of aristocracy and social abstraction. So far as this is true of them, they have invalidated their title to the inheritance of the earth, and it must pass to stronger and more venturesome spirits. For as the earth can never be gripped by mechanical hands, so also it can never be ruled by self-cultivating people, intent upon the safeguarding of their special interests and the saving of their own souls.

Both extremities of society are dead at heart, passionless, and destitute of purpose. Both are ruled by an external law—the one by the law of animal necessity, the other by an intricate code of customary pieties, proprieties, and vested rights. The world is not to be saved by mimicry of the rich or by mimicry of the poor. For both riches and poverty are solecisms and im-

pertinences—the death of the heart's desire. The rich and poor alike are to be drawn back by shame and love into living contact with the people that feel and know the world as it really is.

Effective thinking is orderly and consistent feeling. No one has ever thought to any purpose with his head alone; the thing must be done with soul and body and the whole passion of life. The talk of head-work and hand-work is the pedantry of drawing-rooms and social-reform séances. The distinction is not interesting to people absorbed in doing their work. The man that is wrestling his way into the divine soul of things does not care to soil his hands—or care not to.

We are to be delivered from the infidelity of supposing that the world was made with the ache of toil in it just for the sake of the ache, or as if God were a bungler and must perforce commit the world to a daily dead loss and misery. We are bound to believe, if we believe in life at all, that the necessity of working for what we want exists for the quickening and clarifying of consciousness, the deepening of the sense of per-

sonal existence, and the strengthening and emboldening of the will. Nature holds us hard to her breast, in this straining and necessitous embrace, in order that we may feel the pulse of the blood of God, and come to understand that the Truth is out-of-doors and not in the recesses of the brain.

The archetypal laborer, then, is the man that thinks and feels the most—the man that can correlate, in the synthesis of his sanity and faith, the largest number of concrete and humanly relevant facts. From this point of view it becomes apparent that the university-idea is of commanding importance for the solution of the world-problem. For the university—the strong-hold of the affirmative intellect—is seen to be the source of all human productions—the creator of material civilization.

The university, as it exists, bears to its own intrinsic idea a relation like that which a religious sect bears to the essential church-idea. The actual institutions of the university are the detritus which has been borne along in the stream of history from the banks and shoals of the

ancient world. So closely have the things which are its opposites been identified with it, that in coming to itself the university must seem to deny itself. To the superficial view it has seemed to stand for a learning that receives everything and affirms nothing—offering only an unbounded opportunity for debate; but its real mission is to demonstrate the futility of all the imaginations and eruditions of mental abstraction, and to go forth to the world to communicate to the people the quickening passion of affirmative ideas. The university is to break the immemorial spell of the passive intellect and to expose the superstition of arbitrary law. It will declare that there is nothing so certain in the world as life itself and the chance to live it bravely out.

The ways have been prepared, broad highways of the republic of art and letters leading like Roman roads from the centers of civilization to the ends of the world, for the passage of the university-idea across all the frontiers of politics.

The university contends for the Humanity of

The Axioms

God, the congeniality of the Mind of Nature with the Mind of Man, and the plasticity of all materials to the human ideal. The beginning of its world-conquest waits only upon its discovery of the axioms of its own faith.

CHAPTER VII

THE WORKING-OUT OF THE WORLD PROBLEM

I. When under the old régime the authority of the external law was definite and unquestioned, the organs of that authority and its material forces stood like facts of nature, and it was possible for the stronger spirits to live simple, straightforward lives without mean anxiety or bewilderment. But when the authorities were partially but not wholly discredited—and that is the way the case stands to-day—everything became a problem, and even the strongest men lost their sure-footed confidence and that heroic clearness which is the charm of the old chivalry and romance.

The discrediting of the old authorities did nothing of itself to hearten the hearts of men, and in the absence of faith in God authorities of some kind are necessary. So men have set to work to

find new authorities in place of the old, and the earth has swarmed with political corporations, sects, parties, and schools of specialists. The large and settled tyranny has given place to a teeming host of petty tyrannies, among which one may, in a measure, make his choice.

Those that long for the old heroisms and valors and do not understand the spiritual promise of democracy have proposed a retreat to the old régime, and the reactionary currents are everywhere in evidence. But it is impossible for the world to go back, and the advocates of the old authorities have but increased the general confusion.

There is but one way to retrieve the dignity of mankind and win back the self-respect of the world, and that is to set our faces steadily forward to finish the work that our fathers began. Society will be reintegrated and the old personal faiths will come back a thousand times renewed when we shall have courage to accept without flinching the whole program of the great spiritual revolution. It is too late to bother with dogmas in detail; the time has come to lay the ax at the

root of the tree and destroy the very principle of dogmatism.

If there is any such thing as the logic of history it is time now to make trial of the sovereignty of the people. As a fine sentiment it has been ineffectual; as a practical program it is still the open door of hope. Nobody has a right to expect that humanity, unfettered and unscared, will ruin the framework of the world. At all events, these mercantile and military corporations and the spawning sects, parties, and schools are a poor substitute for God and Law. We have no choice but to go on.

II. The integration of universal society follows upon the integration of the individual soul. The soul has been shattered into fragments because the will has been discredited by the overwhelming aspects of mechanical law. Thus the real desire of the heart has been discouraged, and men have occupied themselves not with the things they would do but the things they suppose they must.

Since every man is tangent to the universe at

just one point, his happiness consists in his doing one thing at a time and doing it exceptionally well. Specialism is the law of creative life when specialism means the grip of the creative spirit of a man-laying hold of the world in his own peculiar way. But specialism is the death of art and joy when it is negative and compulsorythe subjugation of the spirit under the yoke of economic necessity. We have had a plague of mechanicalized specialists. Everywhere we see only fractional people—people that can do a trick. The world is tired of carpenters, clergymen, pedagogists, and all manner of experts and conventioners who see things with the bias of their trade. The earth is barren, and the people starve for the lack of catholic and cosmic-tempered men. Society will grow fluent, expressive, spiritual, and the arts will flourish when the doctors, lawyers, and ditchers are what they are because they choose to be.

The faith that legitimizes the heart's desire is bound to produce a new and more integral kind of man, and that fact is the main reliance of the democratic program. Specialism of the mechan-

ical and regimentated kind is at war with the modern spirit and belongs to the old régime. It tends toward caste and status, and destroys the freedom and vitality of society. When the old régime was in its prime every man's specialism was prescribed by statute law; now it is prescribed and enforced by naked, economic law; that is the whole extent of our achievement up to date.

So long as every man is a partialist and a particularist it is impossible to solve any social problem, because it is impossible to get a social and comprehensive view of any problem. The first requisite of reform is men that choose their own crafts and put the spirit of individuality into them. To break the spell of irrational economics the prime need is poets, artists and lovers of the world. The organization of a democratic catholicism waits upon the coming of such men. The preachers, politicians and savants are ineffective because they are, or seem to be, for the most part hired men retained in a special interest.

We shall rediscover the intrinsic versatility of the human spirit. In the great days of medieval art the artists were painters, sculptors, builders,

makers of roads, and movers of mountains; so it shall be again—and more so. A master of any trade is master of all.

III. The discovery that Americanism is the quintessence of historical Christianity, that the creed of the Church is one with that of democratic society, is bound to furnish the substance of a world-moving evangel. But it is a gospel that can not be carried around the world by clergymen or politicians. The old shibboleths of professional religion and professional politics can not be translated into a universal irenicon. The very names of religion and politics are names of confusion and discord. It is impossible for professional religion to sauctify politics, and equally impossible for politics to sanify professional religion. The distinction between the two stands as the immemorial monument of the original sin and schism of the mind—its inveterate, barren a priorism and a posteriorism, forever bullying the human heart either with the terror of ghostly abstractions or the bald brutality of unrationalized facts. There is no hope of civilization or of

social order, save in the rise and dominance of the affirmative intellect. It is the mission of the university—the Democratic Catholic Church—to meet this emergency of the world. It must provide new catagories of thinking and a new vocabulary of revolution.

The university must stand to represent the sovereignty of the people. It will derive its faith, its world-conquering spirit from the great tradition of the historic Church. But the forms of its expression will be the historical forms of politics. This is no inspiration of prophecy; if it is anything it is psychology—the science of the spiri-'ual processes of history. No one is qualified to av when or under what stress of moral combulsion the reintegration of society will be effected; but it requires no special gift to see that when it does come to pass, the social institution that has sought to represent democracy apart from the concrete facts and the institution that has sought to achieve the fact without the spirit will be available—the one as the spirit and the other as the form of that other and correlating institution whose genius it is to ex-

press the practical power of the God-confident intellect.

The identification of Americanism with quintessential Christianity is the disclosure of the meaning and mission of America. But that meaning and mission can never be expressed and carried out in a social order until it shall be clearly conceived and uttered in the precipitating words of intellect. This is the work of the university. When it shall realize the terms of its own charter and so be capable of uttering effectual words it will perceive that its charter is nothing other than the creeds of Christianity and democracy, and it will proceed to the interpretation of that charter for the enfranchisement of the people.

IV. As the great political parties in the United States have been formed simply by the establishment in every ward of every city of the standard of a definite social ideal—so it must be with the institution of a democratic catholicism. The demoralization of the old parties furnishes the opportunity. The fact that the old parties

have both ceased to represent the old social ideals clears the way for a new social ideal that shall synthesize and transcend the old conceptions.

The decadence of the old parties does not prove the corruption of the American people or their abandonment of ideal aims. It indicates, on the contrary, a general consciousness that the old bottles can not contain the new wine. The people have left the old parties to the politicians because they are becoming aware of the futility of that party-spirit which once engaged their interest. Everywhere there is restlessness. It is the rising of a great hope and the gathering of a great determination. The need of the hour is a definite social ideal that is true both to the experience of the past and the hope of the future an ideal, historic and evolutionary. It must be seen to be no invention of moralists, but the irresistible logic of the history of the world. And it must be thoroughgoing and worth while; the greatest thing will be the most practicable. Such an ideal, definite, morally commanding and logically inevitable, is the ideal of

a catholic democracy to be carried around the world by the university, in the spirit of historic Christianity and in the ways of practical politics.

V. The university, as it plants its standard in town-halls and church-buildings, or in barns and wigwams, from ward to ward and from town to town, will not summon the local assemblies to the general renovation of the world; it will not call people away from their real and present interests to imaginary interests on the other side of the earth; nor will it seek to make universal the provincialisms of New York, or of London, or St. Petersburg. Its endeavor will run in the opposite direction. It will bring the universal humanities to a focus in every village of the prairies, producing catholic individualities and cosmopolitan cities even where the people live in sod-houses or adobe huts.

The university will rally the people to a commanding creed. It will accomplish a clear and practical working organization for the carrying out of that creed in the forms of law and govern-

ment. It will stand in every electoral precinct as a political primary that never adjourns. But its organization, like that of the political parties in their best estates, will be fluent and responsive to the demands of the people. It will not constitute an authority apart from the common life—there will be no oaths or shibboleths, no free-masonries or party-loyalties.

The apostolate of democracy must be made up of world-tempered men who can pass from metropolis to hamlet, and from country to country-at home in all lands-stirring the stagnar. pools of provincialism and freshening them with the universal air. There can be no clergy-caste; the Church of democracy must be governed by the laity, and must draw its material support from the free contributions of the people. The time will come when the people will pour into the treasuries of the university what they now give grudgingly to the sectarian churches, political parties, privately supported colleges, and the innumerable futile charities—so that the material establishments of the democratic ideal may exceed the dignity and splendor of medieval catholicism.

But, for a while, doubtless the ministers and builders of the university must like to live hard.

As the institution of the new catholicism grows to its prevalence and success, it will accomplish what is true and democratic in the vague hopes of college-settlements and universityextension movements. It will get the better of the politicians, and will probably take out of their hands the control of the whole system of public education. Its local organization, like that of the political parties, will have definite territorial limits, and will no doubt keep its census of souls, or parish-register, with all of the painstaking that is practised by Tammany Hall, so that every child that is born shall have a social status and a name to be known by. The secret of Tammany is its utter humanism-it keeps close to the concrete. It prevails over the scholars-in-politics and the ecclesiastical crusades, and deserves to prevail, because it has renounced abstraction and acts in the power of the affirmative mind. The political organizations of which it is the type can never be weakened by preaching or repressed by law. They must be super-

seded by that which alone deserves to supersede them—to wit, a social organization whose humanism is wider and more affirmative than their own.

The new catholicism must seek to make every parish a little world pulsing with the life of the nations and the ages—a comradeship in what is great and fine, and an intimate neighborhood wherein men know and help each other.

After the religious fanaticisms are a little dulled it may be possible for the people to understand and rejoice in those two great rituals which have stood for ages to celebrate the polar principles of democracy — baptism and the holy communion of the common bread—the symbol of individuality and the symbol of universality. Tho, indeed, we could even do without the symbols, if necessary, after we had got a measure of the substance.

VI. In a word, the free association of the people, institutionalized in the university, must supersede the sovereignty of the state as the representative of the original and essential vitalities of society. This can be accomplished only

through a moral and intellectual volte face-a social, spiritual experience which is the ethical reality that has been sometimes foreshadowed, but oftener travestied, in sectarian theories of conversion. It consists in the appreciation of the fact that the régime of justice and liberty becomes possible only when the social center of gravity falls not in this actual world but in the infinitely resourceful world of the yet-to-beaccomplished ideal, and that it is impossible to break the yoke of the military and economic power until the people understand that society is society before it is a police-force or an industrial partnership. The growing appreciation of the subordinate and conventional character of all legal and political institutions will make it possible for the university, in its progress around the world, to efface by a gradual but irresistible process the political frontiers.

The ministry of the university opens a worldregenerating career to those that love the great adventures of the ideal. They will not imagine that things can be accomplished with ease because they are morally inevitable and lie in the broad

track of the logical movement of history. History swirls and sags, but does not move forward without risk and loss. And the men that are to do the things that are to be done must be trial-tempered paladins of faith, broad-shouldered in the soul, and big enough to press hard on the gate for the turning of the hinge of universal history.

VII. In the light of the new orientation of the mind which this ministry will accomplish the insoluble social problems will grow soluble. The seemingly irreducible contradictions will yield to a process of synthesis. Neither socialism nor individualism will prevail, but both—in a sense different from either. And so of imperialism and anti-imperialism, capitalism and laborism, conservatism and radicalism, and so on through the catalog of class-controversies.

It must be borne in mind that the cause of the constant tendency of men to divide into two parties on every social issue is the prevalence of the passive intellect and the attempt to institutionalize a social rule that shall be superior to all individuals.

Now democracy does not deny the existence of a superior authority, social and universal, but it declares that the authority lies in the heart of the Eternal Man, and can not be institutionalized upon the earth. It rests its confidence of the practicability of civilization upon the selfrealization of men, and their quickening and deepening sense of participation in the Eternal Humanity. But everywhere throughout the world to-day the people are still ashamed of their own souls and dare not strive frankly for the things they care about. It always has been the egotistic interest of the upper classes—the classes that have done the thinking and furnished the moral theories—to perpetuate this state of affairs. And never, in any considerable numbers at once, have they escaped from the temptation. The denial of the authority of the human ideal has made it possible to clothe with spiritual sanctions that power of the state which has been, and is to-day, the bulwark of all social privilege. And as the authority of the state has always had a dual expression-transcendentalism on the one hand and brute force on the other-so every

social interest has presented two aspects to the passive and devitalized minds of the people, as it has been looked at from the standpoint of traditional theories, or from that of the present and pressing facts. This schism is, as has been already pointed out, a psychologic necessity under the régime of the passive intellect. It corresponds to the interminable scholastic controversy between a priori and a posteriori logic. Both logical methods are utterly futile and lifedestroying, and would be seen to be so if the slaves of the passive intellect had not been generally saved to some measure of sanity by their unconscious confusion of logical methods.

And if party-spirit has not utterly ruined the world it is because the maddest of a priorists and a posteriorists have usually had some flicker of light from that affirmative intellect which is the creative flame in every man, and will not finally allow the array of reasons and the appearances of things utterly to overwhelm the heart's desire.

The essence of Americanism is the conception that all intellectual and moral authority inheres in the living body of humanity as it faces its

daily problem—while the old and undemocratic régime undertakes to set up a moral and intellectual authority outside of and above the living persons of men.

The cause of the world's demoralization is the establishment of moral authorities, and the explanation of the general weakness of intellect is to be found in the intellectual authorities. Try as he may, a man can not altogether escape from his own soul or from its native perceptions of what is good and true; consequently the reverence for an external authority is sure to destroy his integrity and commit his life to a double standard.

Democracy clears the ground by abolishing all authorities, except the authority of God as realized in living men. It does not abolish moral and intellectual forces; on the contrary, it gives them an incalculable reinforcement through the gains of moral and intellectual integrity.

A moral authority, as distinguished from a convincing moral influence, is simply an intellectual authority under a more pretentious name. And the gist of all intellectual authority is the

attempt to institutionalize a Truth apart from the experienced facts and forces of the world. Now democracy is the return to the physical and spiritual concrete-the real and material facts and forces. It organizes its material forces to defeat and destroy every obstacle that seems to oppose itself to the common health and sanity. If mistakes are made and prophets are killed, that is all in the way of the redemption of the world. the business of prophets to take risks. But legal hangings, punitive expeditions, and so on, would soon come to an end if the self-righteousness and the meritricious moral indignation were cleaned out of the law. A democratic society will be content with the defeat of its adversaries: it will not care to destroy them. It will know how to forgive. And no democratic man or company of such men could ever consent to take a human life without risking their own.

VIII. The democratic revolution can never be understood by mechanical minds—by those that think with their heads only. There is no explaining of the program of the new era to those

that suppose that the world is ordered by theories. It is necessary to understand that society is governed by vital impulses, and that the direction of these impulses depends upon the primary faiths of the people. The changes proposed are not reformatory; they are revolutionary. They are not mechanical, but quasi-chemical. They do not consist in the rearrangement of existing materials, but in the creation of new substances. It is not a question of the repeal of this law and the enactment of that. The revolution goes to the root of the matter, and reconceives the whole legal system from the ground up. New laws are indeed to be made, and old ones set aside; immense structural changes are to take place. But these changes would be entirely ineffectual, would be canceled or wrested to the interests of privilege, if they were to be accomplished by mere argument and agitation while the spirit of the law remained unchanged. They are to be made effectual only by bringing to bear new social forces in a new and affirmative faith.

IX. The new spirit may be practically appre-

hended by keeping in mind the three following propositions, which have been already suggested in detail, but which must be gathered up and taken together for the sake of the light they shed upon each other.

In the first place, then, the old social spirit regards the heart's desire of the individual as essentially bad, however capable of achieving virtue; while the new, on the contrary, regards it as essentially good and legitimate, however capable of corruption. This is the primary principle of democracy. It gives practical sense to the assumption that an ordinary man has vital relation to the infinite, and it justifies the rule of the affirmative intellect. Its assertion marks the transition of human consciousness from the status of creatureliness to that of creativeness.

Secondly, the spirit of the old order aims to give every man his deserts according to the definitions of an external law, while the aim of democracy is to give every man the utmost chance to live a creative life. The only equality known to the old order, even in its most liberal and modern aspects, is an equality "under the

law." Its theoretical operation is to give every man an equal chance to become the master of other men. Practically this is impossible, and the principle of "equality under the law" produces and maintains grosser inequalities than those that existed in the more ancient régime of pure status. The new spirit, on the other hand, proclaims an equality that is above the law. It makes the law the instrument of an equality that is more august than the law itself. It affords no countenance to egotistic ambition or to envy, and has no prizes for the exceptionally good and no punishment for the exceptionally bad. The only goodness that it recognizes is creativeness, and that is its own reward in vital strength and competency. And it knows of no bad but consumptiveness, which is its own punishment in loss of life. It has no scale to measure the relative value of services—counts the tunneling of mountains and the cutting of isthmuses fine, but no finer than any other fine deed. It knows nothing of natural or creaturely rights—as the rights to take toll, to live on the labor of others, or to make a nuisance of one's self; it recognizes only spiritual or crea-

tive rights. And these, in all persons under all changing circumstances, are absolutely equal. It is not concerned with abstract proprietary rights, but gives all its respect to the concrete personal right to hold and vitalize as many brute things as one can. It has no prejudice against large possessions or small ones, but it protests at sight of a beggar or a magnate—a man that is servile and envious, and a man that lives by the baseness and hunger of other men.

The third proposition is that, whereas the old régime starts with law and order and strives for liberty, the new begins with liberty and strives for law and order. So long as the agencies of law—executive, legislative, and judicial—constitute the nerve-center of national life, and the people have no consciousness of national or social existence outside the machineries of government, no preaching or praying can possibly prevent their settling every social question from the state-supporting standpoint. The party that is most bent on the aggrandizement of government will always seem to be the safest and will always carry the day. There will be little chance of releasing

the incalculable, creative energies of liberty. Liberty, the opportunity to live one's own life according to one's genius, will be regarded, not as the source of law and spring of civilization, but as something that the law allows, within ever narrowing limits. It will be a legal franchise, not an inalienable right. On the other hand, when the people shall have established a standing-ground for their national and social life in aloofness from the machinery of government, they will be able to regulate their affairs in the interests of liberty.

The tyranny of the high-seas would be insupportable, and anything could be done against the crew and passengers on the plea of safety for the ship, if there were no shore where explanations are demanded. Democracy proposes to establish a seaboard and a serene district court, and to set limits to that raging main of public policy on which the ships of state are forever tossing, with shipmasters calling for more power and more law. But this is the lowest statement of the case. The truth is that the new régime will work a complete revolution in the law from

top to bottom, shifting the point of view from conventional to primordial rights.

It is not at all a question of the width of the scope of government and law. That is where the controversy between the individualists and the socialists raises a false issue. A democratic society may enact what are called sumptuary laws and may enter into the minutiæ of social life, making the people's clothes and warming their houses, or it may do none of these things. These are secondary matters, and they can not be settled in a democratic sense until they are regarded from the democratic point of view. The question that democracy asks concerning any proposed extension of the sphere of government and law is this: Will this new exercise of compulsion increase the opportunities of liberty?

X. There is no validity in the distinction between industries that are in their nature public and those that are private. All productive work is in its nature both public and private—private, as being the expression of the lives of individuals; and public, as being directed toward the general

welfare. For any work that is not directed toward the general welfare has no right to any social recognition whatever. Being a nuisance, it deserves simply to be abated. The workable distinction lies between those operations that are of so elementary and necessitous a kind that they can be reduced to routine, like the alimentary and respiratory habits and unconscious reflex actions of the body, and, on the other hand, the activities that are distinctly creative and human. But the coarser, mechanical interests run up into and interpenetrate the finer interests. And the finer interests run down into the coarser interests in such manner that it is impossible to draw a line between the two in any other than an expediential and temporary way. All that can be said is that, as the individual must not be ruled by his stomach on pain of the forfeiture of his humanity, so a society of individuals must, if they would be free and human, insist upon controlling the governmental routine from a vantageground of the humanities.

Democracy is the discovery that a human life can not be lived by all of us or any of us so long

as we lie passive under the hand of habit and necessity. So long as the alimentary problem is studied from the alimentary point of view it remains insoluble. Democracy therefore sets its feet firmly in the sphere of the creative spirit, determining to die cheerfully rather than give up that ground. Government becomes a tool of the ideal. All laws are to be repealed that have cramped the creative powers of the people. man can have any real and creative interests against the creative life of humanity. It is for no man's good that he should be allowed to stand in the way of civilization. The rich-so far as they are parasitic—are wronged by their rights. Democracy owes it to their souls to divest their vested interests. All fraternal consideration they shall certainly have. But material compensation?—that is possible only in a very limited Mainly it is absurd and impossible.

All interests are parasitic that involve a curtailment of the productive powers of the people. Society is a vast cooperative concern. But as it stands with its divine head in the heavens and its feet in the dust and mud, there must needs

be two fairly distinct spheres of its cooperation—the sphere of liberty and love, and that of compulsion and law. The régime which is passing away has dominated the former from the standing-ground of the latter; it has subordinated the creative spontaneities of life to the supposed necessities of law. The mission of democracy is to reverse the terms, subjecting the law to the uses of liberty.

XI. It is not enough to say that all the people have an equal right to the land and to the elements of nature. They have an equal right also to the ideal goods of the race, the hereditiments of civilization. The assertion of the former right would in this day be of no avail without the assertion of the latter. Time was when the landlord was the ruler of the economic world, but that time is past. That ancient world which the landlord ruled had not conceived the idea of the conquest of nature, while the economics of these times is motived through and through by that idea. Economic production was once carried on in intellectual passivity, but now

the affirmative intellect is beginning to have its day, and industry is becoming a creative art. The world-power has passed from the hands of the landlord; it rests now in the hands of the capitalist. The world will no longer be ruled by sheer natural facts; henceforth it is to be ruled by ideas. And capitalism is a symbol-albeit, a corrupt and degraded symbol-of the ideal forces. Capitalism has appropriated the ideal goods to the uses of the few; the sovereignty of the affirmative intellect has been usurped in the interest of a class. The work of the future is to democratize the ideal powers by deepening the intellect of the controlling class to its ground in the common human faith, and by awakening the passive spirits of the people.

The mere nationalization of the land would, in these days, afford scarcely a temporary respite. If the people were faithless to democracy, if the root of the matter—the liberty, equality, and fraternity—were not in them, Capitalism, with its awesome enthronement in the sovereignty of states, could pay all the rent, support all the governments, supply the masses with schools, libra-

ries, museums, circuses, and bread-doles—and utterly ruin the world.

XII. The normal elements of production are two: nature and the workman—the intellect of God implicit in the order of the natural universe and the intellect of man making himself at home there. The orthodox economists, writing under the spell of the passive intellect and in a social order thralled in that spell, have made it out that the elements of production are three-to wit, nature, labor, and capital. That is to say, they have split the human element into two parts. As we have seen, this was ever the way with the old régime. Laborism is humanity subjected to a law of natural necessity; capitalism is the same humanity under a law that is ideal, but no less compulsive and unfree-to wit, a law of mechanical necessity.

The power of capital is that it can bring a thousand men to work a thousand days with a mutual confidence in one another—based upon the power of the police. Most of the wealth of the capitalist is not things, but claims. He

is not so much a curator of real and tangible tools as the social representative of a kind of meretricious and artificial credit. If there should come into any community a genuine and authentic capitalizer of the people's credit-a kind of commercial hero and master of materials, who was believed in by the community and justified belief-he could do an unlimited banking business without any capital whatever, and there would be no end of his power as a promoter of enterprises. And if some little town on the verge of civilization should be converted to democracy while the world lingered-realizing the practical sense of liberty, equality, and fraternity-it would become a commercial metropolis within a decade without borrowing a dollar from the outside world.

The talk of the capitalist as a necessary saver and tool-keeper is the tale of the infant-class in economics. It is not, in any important sense, true. Most of the world's capital is renewed every year or two. The simple account of the power of the capitalist is this: a highly complicated material civilization entails a high degree of industrial

cooperation; and large cooperations-with their postponed results-require credit. This credit can be secured in either of two ways: the people must believe in each others' strength and sanity, or else they must believe in the power of a common master. There is no middle course. The capitalist will be the master of our complex modern society-and he is not only inevitable, he is indispensable—so long as the people's belief in each other is smaller than the bulk of their material civilization. If the capitalist did not exist it would, as things stand, be necessary to invent him. Cooperation requires credit, and if the available real and human credit is not vigorous enough to compass the magnitude of the enterprises that are proposed, then it is necessary to establish in the hands of some particular person or persons a legal or artificial credit, a huge accumulation of enforcible claims. The essence of capitalism is the reliance of society upon the police force for the maintenance of that credit, which is the sine qua non of social cooperation. The only possible remedy for the tyranny of capitalism consists in making our humanity match the size of our civili-

zation, either by reducing the complexity of the latter or increasing the energy of the former.

The socialistic proposition to put the control of industry in the hands of public and political officers contains no promise of substantial melioration. For as things actually stand the capitalists are already public officers—since their power is the power of the police.

XIII. In the long run trade demands that the buyers and sellers should think and deal in the terms of a common law; consequently there is an irresistible tendency toward the unification of law within the circle of commerce. The only effectual way of perpetuating the distinctness of national codes and the legal solidarity of separate states is to put impassable barriers in the way of commerce. This was once a practicable expedient; it is no longer so. For capitalism, having impoverished the masses in the old centers of commerce and exhausted their purchasing capacity, is compelled, for the continuance of its own power, to seek foreign markets. And capitalism is the power behind the throne of all the sovereign

states, and will insist upon the security of its investments in the newly exploited countries. The program of political expansion is apt to be favored also by the wage-earning classes of the ruling nations, since in general it offers them a temporary respite, shifting the heaviest burdens of economic slavery to a foreign and still more helpless proletariat. The effect is to take the lower classes temporarily—but only temporarily—into the capitalistic trust for the exploitation of Asia, Africa, and the islands.

The collision of interest between the rival capitalisms of different nationalities is a merely transitional fact. It would come to an end when the unappropriated territories had been exhausted and the various spheres of influence delimited. After that the interests of capitalism throughout the world would be absolutely solidaire. It is like the rush for new lands in Oklahoma. Every man's hand was against his neighbor until all the land was appropriated; then the possessing class was a unit for the protection of all titles against the non-possessing.

Upon the settlement of the spheres of influence would follow, if capitalism were to have its way, the carrying out of something like The Hague program—the establishment of a supreme international court, or sovereign of sovereignties, backed by irresistible power for the enforcement of its decrees. The court, by the terms of its constitution, would not be called upon to interfere in disputes between the several great powers and their dependencies; the subjugation of the weaker people would go on to its utter conclusion. The inauguration of such a world-state would be the complete triumph of capitalism in alliance with the principle of sovereign authority, and would exhibit a full and perfect antithesis to the ideal world-order of historic Christianity It would be the bathos of hisand democracy. tory and the reestablishment of the theocratic régime.

The lines of cleavage which now separate nations would be shifted so that they would separate classes by a gulf wider than the seas. There would follow a recrudescence of heredity and caste. An infinite peaceful carnage of the

poor and weak would go on in the midst of a perpetual outpouring of charity. The Holy Alliance of governments would in due time set up some kind of a universal ecclesiasticism for the worship of an alien and non-human God. Sacramentalism, in some new and modern garb, would separate the officially good from the bad by impassable walls of excommunication-and pharisaism would be the only virtue. The university would be a function of state, and the only office of intellect would be to find reasons for the status quo. Dogmatism would prevail with invincible sway, and the press would be the censored exponent of the social code of plutocracy. Art would return to be the sycophant of the rich, and literature would be mere weariness of print. Officialdom and bureaucracy would offer the only career for talent. There would be nowhere between the poles an individual; the mob would possess the earth and the spirit of the race would be broken.

XIV. But this is all an imagination. Thus and so it would be if revolutions could go back-

ward; but they can not. It is impossible to reestablish the ancient régime. The perfect plan of capitalism and universal state sovereignty is bound to fail. The real issue lies between democracy and chaos. The people en masse can not be got to believe in theocratic religion; therefore the theocratic social order is out of the question. The people will go on, through the mist and confusion, to believe in the religion of democracy, or else they will believe in nothing at all, and society itself will become impossible. For there is no society without a common faith. Our real and practicable choice lies between endless class collisions and insurrections, accomplishing only terror and misery, and on the other hand the universal prevalence of a Democratic Catholicism, maintaining a world-wide commerce and a frankly human common law.

XV. The use of studying international politics is to discover their futility. The international issues are simply a blind to the real issues. The haute politique is a narrow provincialism; the catholic and cosmopolitan issues are local. It

makes no considerable difference to anybody, not even to the little knots of capitalists whose bankaccounts are concerned, and certainly not to anybody else, how the territorial lines shall be drawn and the maps colored.

The real issues upon which the fate of the world is turning are to be encountered in their complete alignment in any county or township. The real question is a social question; and the social question is at bottom simply the choice between theocratic and democratic religion, with the fearful proviso that if the moving spirits elect theocracy they will be reckoning without the people. The people will not-can not if they would-accept such leading. And such a choice would commit the world to a welter of confusion such as would make the Dark Ages seem radiant with light. There is only one avenue of promise, and that lies straight ahead along the great historic highway of evolutionary democracy. We have arrived at a point in the road where the integrity of society can no longer be maintained on theocratic and authoritative principles. Meanwhile society has been leavened through and

through with a latent and potential democracy. The transition to the new régime can be accomplished in peace and order like the mighty mystery and cataclasm of natural birth; but if the process is opposed and prevented there will be an agony of travail.

XVI. This is not a world of mockery: the impossible is never necessary. Social order has become impossible on the old plan; it must then be possible on the new plan. It must be possible now after these ages of preparation—and here in the country which is most democratic of all-to break the spell of sect and party, and to accomplish such an association of the people as shall suffice for the maintenance of a democratic code of law-a law disclaiming all pretence of state sovereignty or transcendent authority, resting frankly upon the general reasonableness of men, and having only such validity as is conferred upon it by private persons at the cheerful risk of their own, not others', lives. The distinguishing mark of such a legal system—a mark which is the seal and substance of our American charter

of independence—is that, not the law itself, but the common liberty and equality of the people, is conceived of as the primary social fact. It is nothing that men of all conditions should be assured that the definitions of the law will be applied without respect of persons. We have never had that assurance indeed; but if we had it. it would not of itself save us from the most ruthless oppression of the weak. The point is that democratic jurisprudence is utterly careless of all rights except such as avail for the defense of the common right to life and liberty. The equality of the people is, as has been shown, not an equality under the law, but above the law; the law is simply its instrument. Of course, such a principle as this is foolishness, and a stumbling-block to all sectarians and partisans. It is the hardest saying in all Holy Scripture, but the secret heart of the world is set upon it and the momentum of history is behind it. The last man in the vineyard is as good as the first.

Now, the practicability of establishing a government whose sovereignty shall exist simply in the consentaneous wills of the people, depends upon

the cordial rejection of the old legal principle of deserts, and the acceptance of the principle of supra-legal equality. If a controlling element of the people in the United States are not ready for this, then we must fail to meet the crisis of the world. The program of democratic catholicism becomes for us impracticable, and we must die in the ruins of the old régime.

The history of the world turns upon the question whether the stronger spirits in the United States—now in the beginning of the twentieth century of the Christian era—will understand and practically approve the story of the Prodigal Son, in its assertion of the indefeasible equality of all persons and its negation of the old world-principle of privilege and deserts.

XVII. As order is the essence of intellect, social order is an intellectual affair. Civilization can not be built on amiable sentiments. The principles of liberty, equality and fraternity can never actuate a social order until they are apprehended as axioms of the intellect. They must be seen to be the more or less conscious assump-

tions of all valid intellectual processes—the roots of the common sense of men. The opening of the new era is to be signalized by the bringing to high and deliberate consciousness of those primary intellectual and moral assumptions without which the old régime itself would have been unlivable and would have unpeopled the planet.

The evangel of democracy is the open discovery and announcement that the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity are the indispensable basis of all valid science and civilizing art—yes, the basis of sanity itself. The gradual rise of the affirmative intellect, with its assertion of the great historic creeds of Christianity and democracy, is the long gray dawn of the world's health.

The elan of all creative life is the prepossession that there is an Intellect back of nature, and that this Intellect is, in its inner law, congruous with the intellect of common humanity—is, in a word, itself human. If this prepossession is false, then science and art are both alike impossible. For a man can not know and work in a world that is founded on non-human principles.

Democracy begins, therefore, with the axiom

of the Incarnation—the doctrine of the humanity of God. It lays that stone as the corner-stone of the civilization of the world. And it writes on the pediment of its pro-cathedral: Liberty, Equality and Fraternity—Liberty, because it is in the individual and not in any corporate state that the consciousness exists that can understand the consciousness of God; Equality, because privilege is the creature of corporations, and no man standing alone with God can deny the equal humanity of other men; Fraternity, because the consentaneousness of human wills and the issuance therefrom of a congenial and catholic law is the foregone conclusion of common sanity.

XVIII. Democracy submits to majorities, not because majorities are right, but because it has faith in the final common sense of men, and loves beauty and order more than victory or martyrdom. It hates the fanaticism of little crowds as much as that of large ones—more, indeed; for if the salt of the earth shall lose its savor the world will rot.

A democratic man fights not for sovereignties and fine sentiments, but only for the concrete things—the human and personal chivalries that a man standing alone might fight for.

The English-speaking race to-day in the Philippine Islands and in South Africa is in contact it is bound to adjust its relations to these people in such a manner as will tend toward the unification of law. This end could easily have been attained if the parties concerned had had a working belief in the principle of the sovereignty of the people. The one thing that has stood in the way of a peaceful adjustment of relations has been the common obsession of the sovereignty of governments. The conception on every side has been that the law flows down out of some high fountain of authority instead of rising up out of the wills of the people. The question of establishing a common law has therefore been posed in a juristic, abstract, and transcendental way. Men have not dealt with men, but politicians with politicians. The question proposed has not been, How can we best achieve the practical interests

of civilization, protect life and property, and release the creative energies of the people? but, Where shall we set the throne of transcendental authority?

The Filipinos and the Boers have fought for two small sovereignties; we of the northern lands have spent our blood and money for two larger ghosts. But all alike have fought for phantoms and are bound to lose. The rising tide of democracy will sweep away all sovereignties of state.

The democratic spirit has not indeed come yet to its clear utterance, but the day of that pronouncement is at hand and events are shaping its words. Democracy comes to itself by confronting its contradictions. The denial of the principles of the world-republic is necessary to their convincing affirmation.

These principles, expressed in the terms of politics, are Universal Law and Decentralization. In terms of Christianity they are Catholicism and Conscience.

The practical program of democracy is, on the one hand, submission to the majority in all the dogmas and futile forms of politics, and, on

the other hand, the world-wide association of sensible men in truceless warfare against the money-power and the mob, for real liberty and the solid things of civilization.

XIX. The mark of the world-movement now in progress is its sublime materialism. It would win heaven by its humility and earth-grip. That is the genius of Christianity and democracy. The awakened intellect can not interest itself in purely ethical problems. The preaching of abstract righteousness to a generation that is girding itself with joy for the work of world-making is as idle as the whistling of the wind.

The philosophy of democracy is the negation of all mere philosophy; its use is to break the ancient spell of mental abstraction and to deliver the soul to enterprise. The Truth for which the raptured sages have striven—what is it? It does not exist. The only Truth that the new age knows is practicable Fact. To make the soul at home here is the sum of its philosophy. Its sacrifice is civilization, and it has nothing else to do.

The final judgment upon the old order that is passing away is that it has not known how to build a city or conduct the commerce of the world. It has been full of futility and words, has talked interminably of rights and duties, and devastated the gardens of the earth. It has dreamed of gorgeous empires and smothered the creative spirit of mankind. The tools of the Titans have been put into its hands, and it has turned the edge of every one of them. Its stupendous machineries have made grist of its own flesh. The ban upon it is incompetency.

The old régime has scared itself to death with the ghosts of its own imagination. The Nineteenth Century was frightened out of its faith by the discovery of the size of the cosmos. It made a fetish of capital, and cringed to corporations because it was afraid of the elemental facts. In its hurry to be safe it had no time to be civil, and it forgot the fine arts. It ran to the state for patronage and protection as timid children huddle under their mother's skirt. Its Great Powers fought no battles—except against the weak. They sapped their

strength in building armaments as a monument to their fears.

But now, out of the welter of cowardice and ineptitude, a new day breaks in repentance, to affirm the existence of the soul and the practicability of civilization. The business of these times and the special mission of the American spirit is to set free the creative energies of the people, to girdle the earth with splendid and cosmopolitan cities, and to express, in the eternal, fluent forms of art, the infinite romance of humanity.

XX. Will the University spring up out of the common ground as if it were a new creation, and destitute of a great tradition? Yes, if necessary. Nothing can prevent its rise—no blindness or obstinacy of those that stand in the way. The stream of history may be driven into subterranean courses, like the great rivers of the arid West, but we are bound to believe that, in spite of all obstructions, it will come to the surface again. There can be no hiatus in a stream.

There is, however, an open and obvious chap-

nel between the old catholicism of dogma and that democratic catholicism toward which we are pressing. And, strange as it may seem to those that have not pondered the matter, that channel is the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. Here is the line of least resistance between the greatness of the old régime and the greatness of the new. If the current of history shall eventually take some other line—which is quite possible—it will be because the representatives of the historic church tradition in this country have successfully opposed their provincial conceits to the logic of their moral destiny.

Anglican churchmanship in America is insignificant in numbers, but an umbilical cord is not a thing of bulk. And the proper business of protestant episcopalianism is just to wither and be buried out of sight in giving life and birth to democratic catholicism—the flesh and blood of the University. The sect must sow itself as the seed of the Church.

This protestant episcopalianism—confused, inarticulate, half-conscious as it is—is big with

potentialities. It can not be said, perhaps, that it has a great idea, but it is a great idea. It is the only extant thing in Christendom that is obviously driving toward catholicism by the free highway of intellect. Universality, through individuality; law and order, through sheer gains of liberty—this is of the very genius of the United States. It is no European importation, but was born on this soil.

The signs of this development have not been sufficiently noted. They are obvious enough. The unquestioned existence within the Episcopal Church of contradictory schools of speculative thinking, representative of about every possible view of theological things, is a sufficient advertisement to the world that this organization can not rest for long on any sort of dogmatic basis. It must, in the near future, either be torn to fragments by the irreconcilable theories of warring factions, or else must awake to a clear consciousness of its actual state, and frankly offer the unique spectacle of a thoroughgoing protestantism—the first church in history to respect the right of private judgment and

build a social structure on a basis of intellectual liberty.

That this Church is bound by the very nature of its constitution either to be the Mother of the University or else to die barren is evident from another point of view. It follows from its historical attempt to associate the protestant principal of private judgment with the catholic principle of territorial jurisdiction. This principle of territorial jurisdiction means, if it means anything, that not merely the people who agree with each other, but all the people-whether they know it or not, and whether they like it or not-are in some real sense within the pale of the Church. Now, if the Church takes all the people of the community into account, the only way that it can establish an intellectually restrictive dogma is the Roman Catholic way. It must be maintained that the intellect is nil so far as the subjectmatter of the dogma in question is concernedthat the natural mind has no competency for that kind of truth. Then, if one of the Church's teachers changes his mind he can be consistently and logically banned and put down. For to

change one's mind about matters that private judgment has no right to deal with is indubitably wicked.

But a church that gives any sort of countenance to the protestant principle must, if it would establish a general dogmatic agreement among its members, give up the claim of territorial jurisdiction. It must become simply a company of people that think alike. In that case, if the preacher becomes heterodox it is logical that he should be put out of the society. He can go elsewhere.

Thus Rome and the run of the protestant sects are involved in no self-contradiction in their several methods of maintaining dogmatic unity. But the case is different with the Protestant Episcopal Church. This Church, in its attempt at dogmatic unity, is involved in a logical absurdity—a practical impossibility. When its authorized teacher changes his mind, this Church cannot say, as the Roman Church does: "You are wicked and an apostate; be silent, the people shall stop their ears if you speak!" The Protestant Episcopal Church cannot say this,

because it is protestant, and Protestants must change their minds once in a way—it is even their duty. Neither can the Episcopal Church do as the protestant sects do; it can not say to its prophet of the strange vision: "You have ceased to be one of us; go outside into the world!" It can not say this because it claims territorial jurisdiction, and refuses to admit the existence of an outside world. Its heretics must therefore stay within its pale, and that too without moral stigma. To sum up the case in a word, this Church, being protestant, cannot put its heretics down; and, being catholic, it cannot put them out. The situation is certainly fatal to orthodoxy.

In this extraordinary dilemma, unexampled hitherto in the Christian ages, it is possible for the American Episcopal Church to give up its claim of territorial jurisdiction and confess itself one of the catalog of protestant sects, or it is possible for it to give up its protestantism and confess itself a scion of Rome; but it cannot go on for twenty years more along the lines on which it is now moving, without emerging into

a new era as the open champion of intellectual liberty committed to the organization of American society on a basis of undogmatic faith.

The hegemony of the historic Church of our race would then pass from Canterbury and York to New York and San Francisco. The Anglican Church, democratized and extending the organic filaments of an international socia1 order throughout the English-speaking world, would not fail to give expression to the university ideal -effacing the hard lines of race and class, and reducing all political and economic corporations to a utilitarian basis. It would be seen that the cause of intellectual liberty is not of mere academic interest, but the burden and passion of Christianity; that it means the defeat of economic and political tyranny, and the release of the creative faculties of mankind.

The Church, in becoming the open champion of intellectual liberty, must pass through a momentous revolution. For so long as the Church puts the lightest fetter upon the intellect, it is itself a monopoly and the chief of monopolies—the bulwark of the old régime. But as it passes—

through the long processes of historic evolution—out into the open air of intellectual liberty, the Church becomes the destroyer of monopolies—the Presence and Power of the sovereignty of the people.

THE END

